ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

THE ‘AGAMEMNON’

OF

AESCHYLUS.

ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

THE 'AGAMEMNON' OF AESCHYLUS

WITH AN
INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND TRANSLATION

BY

A. W. VERRALL, LITT. D.,
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
HON. LITT.D. IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
1904

First Edition 1889

Second Edition 1904

A.D. 1889.

THIS BOOK IS OFFERED

IN TOKEN OF

FRIENDSHIP RESPECT AND WELCOME

TO

RICHARD CLAVERHOUSE JEBB, LITT.D.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF GREEK

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THIS edition of the *Agamemnon* is the second instalment of that edition of Aeschylus which I hope to complete in course of time. The present volume has occupied me for many years, having been commenced long before my edition of the *Septem*, and frequently re-written, as I gained more knowledge of the poet.

No one competent to undertake such a work can flatter himself much upon the little that he can possibly have achieved in comparison with the desirable ideal. It is not likely that, as long as there is any spirit of progress, there will ever be a final edition of Aeschylus. Certainly we are far enough from such a consummation at present. But with all the defects which I see, and the many which doubtless I do not see, I trust that this book is not unworthy of the place in which it has been written and of the great living scholars by whose teaching and encouragement it has been inspired.

Where my version merely follows tradition, the commentary is for the most part silent or brief; and in this sense only I may say that the bulk of it is the product of my own work. But indeed I have the less hesitation in saying so, as I fear that the bulk of it is not a merit.

The English editions of Paley, Kennedy, and Mr A. Sidgwick have been by me throughout; Enger's I have consulted often. Dr Wecklein's interesting and useful edition of the *Orestea* with notes (1889) appeared when this was in the press. This will, I hope, explain anything that may seem obscure in the

relations of the two. All will know the difficulty of dealing satisfactorily with such a case. I should explain that where 'Wecklein's Appendix' is referred to on critical questions, the reference is to the edition of the text with *apparatus criticus* only (1885).

Since the appearance of my former volume Kennedy, Paley, and J. F. Davies have died, honoured and regretted, as I need scarcely say, by me as by all students of literature. To Paley in particular, whatever may have been said or thought of his defects, I shall always profess myself deeply indebted. It was easy to disagree with him and to see the weak points of his scholarship. But few men have done more for the spread of learning and literature in this country. He sent me a few days before he died a vigorous letter of adverse criticism. Most mournfully do I feel that I shall never receive another.

Beyond the editions of the play (my relations to which in general will appear from the several references) the writings most useful to me have been the editions of Sophocles by Professor Jebb (who has permitted me to express my admiration and gratitude by the dedication of this volume), the *Homeric Grammar* of Mr D. B. Monro, Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, and an excellent article on the *Agamemnon* by Mr A. E. Housman in Vol. XVI. of the *Journal of Philology*.

It is not easy to enumerate accurately the friends who have assisted me at various times by conversation and otherwise. But for particular suggestions my thanks are due to Mr R. A. Neil, who was kind enough to revise the whole of the Introduction, to Dr W. Leaf, Mr J. G. Frazer, Mr E. S. Thompson, Mr Wyse, Mr Duff, and Mr H. B. Smith. I have also taken some particular hints from Professor Mahaffy's books on the geography and customs of Greece and from a dissertation on the *Parodos* of the *Seven against Thebes* recently published by Dr Fennell. Other references will appear in their places.

Continual study strengthens my conviction on one not unimportant point in relation to Aeschylus, the substantial integrity of the text. The greater part of what are called errors

of the MS. are merely normal variations of spelling, not affecting the authority of the tradition in the slightest degree. The errors properly so called are often such that their reproduction through long periods, from the time when by their nature they must have originated, bears speaking testimony to the conservative care of those by whom the text was handed down. Although this edition adheres more closely to the MSS. than its predecessors in modern times, my revision, were I to revise it now, would tend rather to closer adhesion than the other way.

Indeed the men who preserved Aeschylus through the long night of literature were protected as much by their defects as by their merits from tampering with the words. They were scholars, as can be proved out of their own mouths, of the narrowest type. In old words, old forms, and the like they were keenly interested. For the poet they did not care. Of the *Agamemnon* the MS. Introduction speaks with a reserve barely saved from disapprobation. And no wonder; for the editors had not read the play, as literature, at all. This is the simple fact. To a reader who wished to understand a drama, as well as make notes of the words in it, no point could be so essential as the fixing and distribution of the parts. The Byzantine scholars were entirely indifferent to the matter. If a modern editor were to adopt the *dramatis personae* of the Medicean manuscript, he would justly be thought a fool. Nor were the Greek commentators unaware that their scheme was dubious; but they would not be at any trouble about a thing of so little consequence to grammar and lexicography. The corrector of the *Mediceus* assigned the speech beginning ἥκω σεβίζων (*v.* 270) to a certain ἄγγελος of his own invention, perceiving that in the scene which follows there was some difficulty in finding speakers for all the speeches. To this ἄγγελος, as appears from the later copies, he assigned among other things the speech **γύναι, κατ' ἄνδρα** (*v.* 363), while to Clytaemnestra he gave **τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα** (*v.* 494). Now nothing is more certain than that

all these speeches are spoken, as all modern editors print them, by members of the Chorus, and that at *v.* 494 Clytaemnestra is not even on the stage[1], and further that no one could have read the play with any consecutive attention from the beginning to this point without discovering these facts. But the Greek editor was looking for glosses, and having once ascertained the correctness of his copy (a work on which he can be proved to have spent very great pains), would not interrupt the true labour of scholarship for a question so trivial as the name of a particular speaker.

Consequently, so far as relates to the literary form and purpose of the drama, the makers of our MSS. bequeathed to their modern successors no more than the vague indication of a problem. In the Introduction our first concern will be with this problem, its nature and the material for a solution.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
27 *September*, 1889.

The present edition is in the main a reproduction of the first, corrected, I hope, and improved in many particulars by the criticisms of others and my own studies.

The translation, which in the former edition was printed separately at the end of the volume, is now placed opposite to the text. This arrangement will be adopted in the *Eumenides* (which is ready for the press) and in any other volumes of the series which I may be able to complete.

The commentary has been made briefer, and for this purpose questions of small importance have been sometimes suppressed, where my opinion, so far as I have one, has not changed.

Appendix III., dealing with certain ancient evidence, which I think important, respecting the *dramatis personae* and distribution of the play, is reproduced (with permission) from an article in the *Classical Review*.

[1] See however note there, 1903.

In the text, the printing of letters in an uncial type different from the rest is used, as in my edition of the *Choephori*, to mark what depends upon conjecture.

In the notes, the use of type does not profess to be consistent. Excerpts from the text adopted are generally distinguished by black type, but so also are conjectural readings, though not adopted, if for any reason they require special notice.

Not a few interesting observations on the play have appeared since this volume was so far advanced in printing, that notice of them, even inadequate, has been introduced with difficulty. Beyond the obligations expressly acknowledged I have received much help in details from friends and correspondents.

The final revision of the book has been done under some special hindrances and, I fear, imperfectly. For such exactness as may be attained the credit is due chiefly to the staff of the Cambridge University Press, who have given me, on this as on other occasions, all possible assistance.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
October 10, 1903.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

I. *The Problem.*

WHAT is the plot of the *Agamemnon*? When the dramatist began his work, what was the story which he proposed to tell, or rather—the difference of phrase is not unimportant—which he proposed to illustrate?

To one familiar only with drama produced under modern conditions, it might well seem strange that this question should be propounded at all. Surely, it might be said, this ought to be a simple matter, to be settled at the first reading. If a drama does not convey its own story, entire and unmistakable, what does it convey? So we might argue, naturally enough, from the conditions of the theatre as we know them in modern times: but so would not argue those who have given much reflexion to the theatre of Athens, and especially of Aeschylus. Every one knows, even if the full significance of the fact is not always sufficiently estimated, that the tragedians of Athens did not tell their story at all, as the telling of a story is conceived by a modern dramatist, whose audience, when the curtain goes up, know nothing which is not in the play-bill.

The story of an Athenian tragedy is never completely told; it is implied, or, to repeat the expression used above, it is illustrated by a selected scene or scenes. And the further we go back the truer this is. Some of the plays of Euripides, such as the *Hippolytus*, are sufficiently complete in statement to be understood perhaps wholly without external aid; and Sophocles fills in his outline more than Aeschylus. Such was the natural result of altered circumstances, of that multiplication of literature and growth of literary education which was the chief characteristic of the fifth century. Before the close of the century the process had so rapidly advanced that literature was a

common occupation, and Athens was full of lads writing, as Aristophanes says, 'tragedies by the thousand.' On the other hand, at the commencement of the century writers were not many, and a literary public scarcely existed at all. One necessary effect of this movement, which took place chiefly in the second half of the period, was to multiply enormously the current varieties of the popular tales; until at last the Athenian playwright was brought, with respect to the foreknowledge of his story by the audience, nearly to the situation of the modern playwright, and found it convenient, if not to tell the whole of it, at least to mark in outline the version of it from which he started. But the original practice, dating from the time when the legends current at one time and in the same city were still fairly harmonious, was to presuppose the story as known; and as a fact there is perhaps not one play of Aeschylus or of Sophocles which would not puzzle a reader who should sit down to it, as to a drama of to-day, having no information on the subject, and expecting everything essential to be supplied by the author.

For a play of Aeschylus then the question, What is the story?, so far from being frivolous, is of the first importance; and so far from being necessarily easy, it is almost certain to offer some difficulties, and might very well prove unanswerable. To reconstruct stories in the exact form which prevailed at Athens in the days of Aeschylus, from the indications afforded by plays presupposing the stories, and from the indirect and ambiguous evidence of such other versions of the same legends as may be more or less perfectly preserved to us, is a task requiring the greatest care. It is not likely ever to be accomplished with all the success that might be wished, and is so far from accomplishment as yet, that in nothing which relates to the study of the poet is there left more room for improvement. We are now to enquire how the matter stands at present with regard to the story of the *Agamemnon*.

The reader who gradually becomes familiar with successive commentaries upon this play, will gradually become aware that they agree with one another in one remarkable peculiarity. As a rule, the first duty performed in the introduction to a drama is to give an accurate and straightforward account of the story. No edition known to me ventures to tell without disguise the story of the *Agamemnon*. I do not of course mean merely that the story told is not correct. This would be to assume the very point we are to discuss. I mean that the story, as it is commonly understood, is itself not told without concealment and practical misrepresentation. The reason for this will be only too apparent, when we have supplied the omission by telling the story

outright, as it was conceived by the Byzantine students of the eleventh century and is still, with whatever dissatisfaction, accepted.

Agamemnon, king of Argos, having sailed with a great armament to Troy, to avenge by the capture of the city the abduction of Helen, arranged with his queen Clytaemnestra[1], who governed at home in his absence, to transmit the news of his success, when it should be attained, by a series of beacons extending over the whole distance. At what time this arrangement was first made does not appear; but when after a war of ten years the city was taken, the beacons had been maintained, we learn, for at least a year. The chief part of the service, the transmitting of the message across the Aegaean Sea, was accomplished by beacons established on Mount Ida in the Troad, on Lemnos, on Mount Athos, and on the highest point of Euboea. Thence the news was to be signalled by comparatively short stages to Mount Arachnaeus, within a few miles of the royal fortress and visible from the palace, where a watch was nightly kept for the expected news. Accordingly on the night in which Troy was captured the system was put in operation, and worked so successfully that before morning the beacon upon Arachnaeus was duly seen by the palace-watch. (At this moment the action of the play commences.) The queen, being roused, at once sends out her commands for general rejoicing, without however disclosing either the receipt of the beacon-message or the purport of it, as appears from the fact that the elders of the state[2], who presently arrive before the palace to make enquiries, are not only ignorant of the event announced, but are still uncertain whether the nocturnal demonstration (for the fires of sacrifice are seen blazing in all directions) is made in honour of some good intelligence or not. After some time, and just upon daybreak (*v.* 291), the queen presents herself, and the elders respectfully ask whether it is her pleasure to enlighten them further.

The queen then informs them that Troy is actually taken. After a few moments of joyful amazement, their next question is, 'When did this happen?' 'This very night.' 'But how could the news possibly

[1] Aeschylus knew her as Κλυταιμήστρα *Clytaemestra*—for I agree with those who hold that we have no reason to dispute the testimony of the Medicean MS. But she must remain *Clytaemnestra* for us.

[2] I have tried throughout so to speak of these 'elders' as to avoid the not very profitable dispute, whether they are to be regarded as councillors, a political γερουσία. It seems to me equally clear on the one hand that their character and behaviour would suggest such an idea to an audience imbued with Greek politics, and that on the other hand Aeschylus intentionally avoided precision on this and all points respecting the constitution of an imaginary state in the heroic times.

arrive so soon?' 'By a beacon-message,' replies the queen, and acquaints them with the arrangements above described, at which the elders are more astonished than ever. The queen makes some reflexions upon the appearance which Troy must present this morning after the ravages of the night, and expresses a hope that the victors will not abuse their triumph in such a way as to court divine punishment and so endanger their safe return. She then retires, leaving the elders to their thoughts.

But the stern satisfaction, which at first they feel for the punishment of the offending Trojans, soon passes away, as they consider the suffering which the war has cost and the deep discontents which it has bred; and they have already sunk again into melancholy and foreboding when the question arises—Is the news true after all? How doubtful is the interpretation of a beacon! How sanguine the imagination of an excited woman! The whole story may well prove to be a mere delusion. It will be best to wait.

They are in this frame of mind when they see approaching a herald, from whose appearance and from other visible indications (for the sun has now risen, *v.* 513) they at once perceive that he has come from the port and brings great tidings. Something grave then has really happened, and they will know in a few moments whether it is good, or what it is.

The herald—if it were possible to suppose the reader of this book absolutely ignorant of the play, I am certain that what I am now going to write would be set down by him as a manifestly absurd mistake or invention of mine—the herald enters and announces *that Agamemnon has arrived.*

But this staggering surprise is nothing to the miracles which remain. The conversation of the herald with the elders—if that can be called a conversation, in which the herald, almost beside himself with excitement and joy, speaks nearly all the time—is terminated by the brief reappearance of the queen, who bids the herald return with a message of welcome to his master. The elders beg him before he goes to satisfy them at least as to the safety of the king's brother, Menelaus. This leads him to disclose that the Greek fleet (which, be it remembered, must have traversed the whole Aegaean in a few hours at most) *encountered on the way a tremendous storm* and was thereby so completely scattered that those on Agamemnon's ship, which escaped destruction, know not even which, if any, of their companions are saved. And with this the herald departs on his errand. The elders, under the weight of this terrible and truly inconceivable disaster, not unnaturally forget for

the moment to rejoice over the return of the remnant, and are still musing sadly upon the terrible and far-reaching consequences of the war and of the offence which caused the war, when the king himself appears to receive their welcome and that of the queen.

And now, it will be supposed, some light will be thrown upon the facts. The story up to this point presents nothing but an inexplicable contradiction. But when Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra meet, all will of course in some way become clear. Nothing of the sort. Though the rejoicings shortly before commanded by Clytaemnestra are still proceeding, and the sacrifices which were to be offered in the palace in honour of the beacon-message are scarcely begun, the queen, coming forth from the unfinished ceremony, addresses to the king a long and high-flown oration, in which there is not the slightest allusion to the events of the morning, nor a word from which it could be supposed that intelligence of the triumph had preceded the king's arrival. Agamemnon, in his cold and brief reply, is equally silent on the subject. That affectionate anxiety for the queen's peace of mind, which we should naturally conjecture to have been his motive, as there is no other apparent, for maintaining such a prodigious machinery of communication and transport, has suddenly given way to a repulsive stateliness. He rebukes severely the pomp of his reception, and there ensues an altercation on this matter between the royal spouses, in which the queen carries her point, and conducts her husband with triumph into the palace, leaving the elders in a puzzled and apprehensive condition of mind, with which the audience must certainly sympathize.

Thus ends the first part or act of the play, which occupies, we may observe, considerably more than half of it. In the tragic scenes or, to speak more properly, in the tragedy, which now commences, the whole of this vast and enigmatic prologue, except certain incidental narratives external to the main subject of it, seems to be simply forgotten. Nothing happens which might not have happened just as easily if the king had returned unannounced, or if he had announced himself in some ordinary manner, and followed his announcement after the expected interval of time. What is dark now remains so, if we accept the received interpretation, to the end of the play. Since therefore the remarkable action of the first part has no particular bearing upon that of the second, and its value in the estimation of the dramatist must be supposed independent, it will be convenient to pause at this point and to consider what that value may be.

And surely the first and most proper reflection is this:—Is it possible that the story above told really represents the intention of Aeschylus?

that a man, who had spent most of his life in writing plays, when he came to lay down the lines of his supreme masterpiece, should encumber himself at starting with absurdities so glaring, so dangerous, and so gratuitous, as this fable exhibits in all its parts? Let us look at it for a moment from these three points of view.

And first, that the absurdities are conspicuous. If we assume, for the sake of argument, that it was indifferent to Aeschylus and the Athenian audience whether the story told was conceivable or not, we may still wonder why the poet should so labour to be false. The first 'act' of the *Agamemnon* is constructed exactly as it would be, if designed to show the monstrosities of it in the strongest light. It is one huge contradiction. It is divided by a crisis, the entrance of the herald (*v.* 508), into two nearly equal parts, the substance of which may be summarised by the statements, (1) that from the fall of Troy to the commencement of the play is a period of two or three hours, (2) that in this interval have occurred the events of several weeks. About this there is not and cannot be any difference of opinion. It is certain, in the first place, that the action is continuous, and falls within the early hours of one morning. Language could not be clearer than that which shows us that the herald arrives while the beacon-message is still in process of becoming known (*vv.* 481—498)[1]. Even the progress of the hour from darkness to daylight is duly noted, as we have seen. But it is needless to labour the point. Had it been possible to suppose the action divided (as in the *Eumenides*[2]), or to assume anywhere a long lapse of time (as in the *Suppliants* of Euripides), the modern readers of the poet, who, as we shall see, are painfully conscious of the puzzle, would have marked the interval long ago. And yet, on the other hand, look at the necessities of the situation, as they are thrust upon our notice by Aeschylus himself. That on the morning after the sack of Troy the weary and famished Greeks would be making the most of their comfortless repose, and be in no condition to think of anything else, is obviously true. But if Aeschylus proposed to bring them that very morning to Argos, why should he insist on reminding us, before their appearance, that they must at this very moment be in Troy,

[1] See also *vv.* 1040 foll.

[2] The example of the *Eumenides* is indeed sometimes cited, as if it explained and justified what would otherwise be surprising in the construction of the *Agamemnon*. There is no resemblance between them. The *Eumenides* is simply divided, like a play of Shakespeare, into three scenes, confessedly separated by gaps of time and changes of place. If the *Agamemnon* were similarly divisible, there would be nothing peculiar about it. See further an Essay on 'The Unity of Time', in my edition of Euripides' *Ion*.

hundreds of miles across the sea, taking their hard-won meal and looking forward to enjoy next night their first unbroken sleep (*v.* 342)? And the very next speech informs us that they are already returned to Argos! Even a happy carelessness might have been expected not to give itself the lie with so much art. Again, the size and general geography of the Archipelago were facts as familiar to an Athenian as those of the Atlantic or the Channel to a modern Englishman, indeed much more so; and he could scarcely, however willing, have imagined them other than they were. But if Aeschylus desired to present a story in which these facts were to be ignored, why should he aggravate his difficulties by prompting the imagination of the audience with a picture of the reality? The conversation between Clytaemnestra and the elders respecting the beacons signifies to us at any rate this, that a voyage over the region described was likely to take some time. A narrator who wished us, for the sake of his story, to suppose that someone had ridden from London to York in an hour, would scarcely begin by reminding us that it takes four hours to go by train.

Then look again at the other side of the picture. To what purpose, in any case, the poet introduced the herald, with his vivid description of the hardships suffered by the Hellenic army and of the awful tempest in which the greater part of it was finally lost, or what is the significance of these narratives to the story, is at present not too clear, as may be seen by reference to the books of authority. But nothing short of a contradiction in terms could be more grossly inconsistent with the preceding scene. If Aeschylus wished to obliterate, by an arbitrary fiction, the interval of time between the fall of Troy and the return of the Greeks, why does he *not* obliterate it? Why narrate the voyage and show that it was not rapid but disastrous? that it was not accomplished in one hour, nor in one day either? that after the capture, and before the return was even commenced, a considerable time was spent at Troy itself in the elaborate destruction of the city, the distribution of the spoil and captives, and other proceedings related or touched upon by the herald and the king? Of these indeed the audience were previously informed by many familiar narratives, but in the design attributed to Aeschylus they might at least have been left in all possible obscurity. Who could listen to the herald's description of the storm, following as it does close upon Clytaemnestra's account of the beacons, and not ask himself in bewilderment at what time all this is supposed to have happened?

This discrepancy of times, not lightly neglected by the poet but studiously obtruded, would, if it stood alone, make the first part of the

b 2

Agamemnon a confounding problem. But it is combined with another mass of difficulty, less prominent perhaps to the eyes of us moderns, but at Athens and in the time of Aeschylus equally fatal to that temporary and conventional belief without which the imagination is helpless. The story of the beacons is in one sense a fine story; that is to say, it is told in fine verse, and the actual description, how the fiery signal was sped, is unsurpassed or unrivalled in its own style of eloquence. But for all that the story is in its whole conception and all its incidents incredible, and it is impossible that a popular audience in ancient Athens can ever have thought otherwise.

In the first place, looking at the matter generally, it is permissible, when we reflect that the *Agamemnon* was written by a grave man of long experience in peace and war, and to satisfy an audience which contained perhaps more men personally familiar with the conduct of great affairs than ever assembled elsewhere—it is permissible, I say, to wonder, that so much should be made of a transaction which, for any relation it has to life, is more worthy of an inventive schoolboy. Here is a great monarch, conducting a distant war of uncertain duration. He establishes between his camp and his capital a system of communication on a grand scale, far larger than anything of the kind actually existing, when Aeschylus wrote, in the Greek world[1]. For what purpose? Naturally, we suppose, to aid his plans. Not at all. At the close of the war, as the ignorance of the elders requires us to suppose, no message had ever been sent, and no message but one was expected. The beacons were maintained and watched, night after night, simply that, if and when Troy should fall, this news, expected for ten years, might have a chance, if the weather were favourable, to reach Argos some weeks or some days sooner than it would do in any case. And as if this notion were not puerile enough, the natural facts are distorted so as to exaggerate the absurdity to the utmost. For in the result it seems to be by the merest accident that the beacon-message arrives before the king. But for the storm he would doubtless have got home first.

Again, if we admit the beacons as a conceivable scheme, what are we to say of the useless and impossible mystery with which they are surrounded? The Athenians were to suppose, that for a year at least there had been maintained on a hill close to Argos, night after night, a beacon forming part of a system of communication with the absent army, and that all this while, so strictly had the secret been kept, the

[1] The generals of Persia were supposed to have projected something similar, though more practicable, at the time of their marvellous expedition (Herod. 9, 3). It does not appear how far they succeeded.

elders of the city had not the least notion of it, nor had ever dreamed of such a thing as possible!

But these general objections, though serious enough, are nothing to the grotesque and wilful violations of nature which appear in the details. It is here that the modern reader most easily deceives himself, forgetting the local and contemporary point of view. No one disputes indeed, so far as I am aware, that the story told by Clytaemnestra is impossible; but most of those who write on the play ignore the subject so far as they can[1]: and hardly any one considers how the matter would look to an Athenian of the Marathonian generation. Yet place and time are the essential conditions.

Men are the willing slaves of imagination; and the inventor who frankly transcends our range of experience may with moderate skill carry us wherever he pleases. But so long as he purports to keep within our experience, the ablest inventor has but a strictly limited power. Not Shakespeare himself could have made the Londoners content to suppose that a Spanish ship lying at the Nore had fired upon an English ship lying at the Tower. They simply could not suppose it. Yet this is the sort of fiction which the Athenians, a people singularly severe in their criticism of the imagination, are supposed to have accepted without demur, and honoured with their highest reward. The description of the beacons (*v.* 293) is curiously complete and careful. Every stage is marked and named beyond possibility of mistake. The first three stages are, as above said, from Mount Ida to the island of Lemnos, from Lemnos to Athos, from Athos to the highest point of Euboea. The distances are for the first two stages about sixty miles, for the third stage about a hundred miles. It is needless to prove that beacons at these intervals would be useless generally, useless even if we did not throw in, as Aeschylus would appear to do, the special facility of a tremendous storm, raging in the very region of the longest transit. Let it be assumed, that in the atmosphere of the Mediterranean, on a clear night, a bonfire one hundred miles away would be made out with ease and certainty[2]. What would be the use of a signal, intended to operate at some unknown time in the course of the year, if it were so arranged as to be defeated by clouds at any point in a traject of one hundred miles? Did then the Athenian audience not know these distances and their relation to the purpose

[1] Not however all; see Paley.

[2] It might possibly be seen, under these circumstances, even much farther. See *Telegraphy of the Ancients* (Merriam), *Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America No.* 1, *Classical Series III.* I have modified accordingly what was said here in the first edition.

of a beacon? How could they possibly fail to know the facts, and to have such a vivid consciousness of them as could not for an instant be put by? Euboea, the terminus of the most prodigious leap, was geographically and politically almost part of Attica itself. Athos, the starting-point of the leap, lay right in the eye of Athenian policy and trade, always specially directed to the north and north-west of the Aegaean. The people were essentially a people of seamen. When the *Agamemnon* was produced, they had been engaged for twenty years in a struggle for the naval dominion of those very seas, a struggle upon which depended most of their wealth and all their national importance. They were familiar with beacons in peace and in war, and used them, as of course everywhere else, in Euboea, to signal to Skiathos, a distance of some twelve miles[1]. The statement that a beacon-signal was transmitted in the midst of a storm from Athos to Euboea stood to the knowledge and habits of Athens then in much the same relation as the statement that a steamer ran across the Atlantic in one day would stand to the knowledge and habits of Liverpool now.

And here again, as in the matter of time, the story is not merely absurd in fact, but wilfully and as it were purposely absurd. If the geographical facts were to the poet indifferent, why is he at such pains to be precise? Nothing would have been easier or more natural, in a mere exercise of the imagination, than to leave the details in some obscurity, to start the signals upon a more or less practicable route, and then to fetch the matter off with generalities, as Macaulay does repeatedly in his *Armada*. But Aeschylus leaves not a loop-hole; and when he comes to the most miraculous part of the story (*v.* 298) he is careful to give our incredulity a jog.

But if the defects of the fable are glaring (and on this enough seems to have been said), they are also extremely dangerous. What is the real opinion of modern critics on this point, the critics themselves show by a testimony more telling than any direct condemnation, by ignoring and, as far as possible, concealing the facts. No one, as I have already said, ventures to tell, as it is received, the story of the play. As an example I purposely choose (for the criticism is in no way personal) a book to which I am much indebted, the edition of Mr Sidgwick. 'The action of the play in details' says Mr Sidgwick in his Introduction 'is as follows:—

Agamemnon has been absent for ten years at Troy. Meanwhile his wife Klytaemnestra has been ruling Argos in conjunction with her lover Aegisthos.

[1] Herod. 7, 182.

The news of the capture of Troy is daily expected, and the play opens with the appearance of the night-watchman on the roof, waiting (as he has been for a year past) for the beacon fire which is to announce the victory. While the watchman is complaining of his trouble, the flame flashes out, and he goes to tell his mistress (Prologue). The chorus enter and sing: meanwhile the queen comes out and is seen lighting the altar fires and preparing for a festal display in honour of the event. The leader of the chorus learns from her the tidings, and after describing the beacon-race, she imagines the scene in Troy and expresses a hope that all will end well (Scene 1). *After another choric song* the Herald appears, who describes first the sufferings before Troy, and finally the storm which scattered the fleet; the queen sends by him *a welcome to her lord* (Scene 2). *In Scene* 3 *Agamemnon returns* with Kassandra'.

Now could it possibly occur to any one upon reading this—more especially if he happened to know that Aeschylus, like a modern dramatist, did not limit his plots to any special period of time—but with or without this information could any one suspect from the above, that all these events are represented as occurring within a few hours? Should we not assume, and is it not indeed tacitly implied, that the action of the *Agamemnon*, like that of its continuation, the *Eumenides*, is divided; and that the necessary lapse of time between these 'scenes' is either expressly noticed, as in the *Eumenides*, or left open to our imagination? But is this what the editor means? On the contrary, long afterwards in the course of the notes we come upon the following, '504. Observe that the herald arrives from Troy, announcing the landing of Agamemnon, immediately after the beacon fires, on the morning after the capture. Such violations of possibility were held quite allowable by the license of dramatic poetry'. This last statement shall be considered presently. But first let us ask why, if this violation of possibility is so simple and so common, it should not be exhibited in the commentary with the same frankness as in the play? Why is 'the action of the play in details' so described as to suppress a feature which we are to observe, and why is the like device adopted, as it is, by one writer after another? It is prompted by the instinct of self-preservation. The expositor, loyally identifying himself with the author, feels that, whatever he may say about dramatic license, the reader will as a fact be repelled at starting by the wanton perversity of the fiction; and he screens it accordingly. How is it that no similar apprehension occurred to the dramatist?

For as to the statement that on the Athenian stage 'such violations of possibility were held quite allowable', I must take leave to say that it is not only without evidence, but altogether contrary to the evidence. There is no example 'such' or approximately such; and the theoretic

treatise of Aristotle on the drama remains to prove, what the extant plays confirm, that the Athenian public, so far from being indifferent to consistency, attached to it an importance much greater than the moderns, and more perhaps than is reasonable. And observe further, that the successors of Aeschylus had a temptation, and so far an excuse, for taking liberties in the matter of time, which Aeschylus himself had not. After Aeschylus 'the unity of time', that is, the restriction of the play to an action within one day, grew into a practice and apparently into something like a rule. It is not always observed; the *Supplices* of Euripides, for example, does not conform to it. But there was a tendency to observe it; and the tendency produced, as it was sure to do, some questionable treatment of this artificial 'day', though neither Sophocles nor Euripides, nor any one else that I know of, ever presents us with a 'day' like that of the *Agamemnon*[1]. But Aeschylus did not so straiten himself. The second scene of the *Eumenides* is separated from the first by an interval of months, if not of years[2]. If therefore he wished to bring into one play the fall of Troy and the return of the Greeks, he had no need to appeal to any dramatic license, nor any temptation to distort the facts. His successors could not have done so consistently with their usual practice, and probably would not have thought it desirable. But to account for the supposed structure of the *Agamemnon*, we must assume that Aeschylus, who ignores the 'unity' in the third play of the trilogy, adopted it for the first play in this self-contradictory form, that the action of one play ought nominally to fall within one day, but that in this 'day' may happen whatever events we please. I think it may safely be asserted that such a theory was never professed by any author or critic whatever.

As I see no reason to think that the popular mind in the time of Aeschylus was in this respect different from the popular mind now, I will offer a Socratic parallel, not the less just because it is homely. —Scene: A room in London. Time: Early morning. Servants discovered preparing the room. From their conversation it appears that the master of the house has been for some time in Africa, and that the conduct of his wife, in relation to a person too often received, is causing them much anxiety and a strong desire for the master's return. They have learnt with satisfaction that their mistress is expecting soon to hear that he is on the way home. A telegram arrives for the lady, who presently appears and informs them that it is from her husband,

[1] See above, p. xviii, note 2.

[2] See the description of Orestes' intermediate wanderings, *Eum. vv.* 239—241, 284—5, 454—5.

and was despatched last night from Lake Nyanza. Being asked by a servant whether there is a telegraph at the Lake, she explains that the wires have just been extended so far by the result of her husband's enterprise. He intends to return forthwith. She wonders what sort of breakfast he is having in Africa, and hopes that he will not meet with any accident on the road back. The table is laid, and the lady is sitting down to it, when there is a ring at the bell. Enter the husband's courier, who announces that his master is detained for a few minutes at the terminus, but is coming immediately. He dilates upon the discomforts of the Overland route and the breaking-down of an Italian train. The husband follows accordingly. He describes the success of his explorations. The lady receives him with rapture but without any surprise. In conversation with him she says nothing of the telegram, nor he to her. And so ends the first scene.—Now at this point of the story we might either know the key to the riddle (if the author were dramatizing a popular novel) or we might wait for the solution in the sequel. But what would be the bewilderment and the dismay of the audience if it should prove that there was no solution, and that the mysterious telegram, introduced with so much circumstance, had no bearing on the story whatever! I submit that this is not the way in which the crowns of the drama may be won, and that the most rigorous proof should be required before we assume that it ever was.

And so we come to our third point, that these glaring and dangerous defects of construction are also useless and gratuitous. After all, this is perhaps the chief matter. The imagination will work for very moderate wages; but it does expect to be paid something, and a little extra for over-time. There is perhaps no limit, there is certainly no ascertainable limit, to what men will grant to a narrator in the way of supposition, so long as he justifies the concession by making use of it and gives interest for the loan, or in plain words, so long as the supposition is required by the story. A classical example is the story of *Oedipus*[1]; but in fact almost every story illustrates in some degree this principle of criticism, and the readers of fiction are applying it every day. If a romancer were to declare that a whole fleet was wafted, spirited, or what you will, five hundred miles in five minutes, and if out of this fiction were developed incidents of interest requiring the supposition, it is quite possible that his audience or his readers might be perfectly content. But the wild

[1] See the remarks of Sir R. C. Jebb in his Introduction to the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, p. xlv.

assumptions debited to the *Agamemnon* explain nothing, lead to nothing, serve nothing. If the circumstances of time and place were as natural as they are in fact prodigious, the supposed story would still be a marvel of discontinuity. Let any one suppose the opening scenes of the play, as far as the entrance of the herald, to have survived as a fragment; let him notice the striking incidents which centre upon the announcement of the beacon-message, the night alarm, the amazement of the elders, their vain attempt to get more information from the queen, their open incredulity; and then let him consider how he would have conceived the lost remainder. Why does the poet occupy us with the beacons at all? When with all this expense of falsehood the king is at last brought upon the stage, and the play, which is now nearing its middle, begins for the first time to be connectedly intelligible, all the preliminary apparatus, as we have already said, is simply neglected. Nay more, the only fact which emerges, if anything does, from the perplexity of the introduction—that the king in some unexplained manner came home with astonishing speed and arrived almost as soon as he was announced—, so far from accounting for the sequel, greatly aggravates the difficulties of a narrative, which, as we will show, could ill afford the increase.

Almost every fine story, and in particular almost every story suitable for the stage, contains a certain element of essential improbability. Contrast, so important in dramatic effect, will generally require surprising incidents, and what is surprising cannot be altogether likely. The story of Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra is no exception to this general rule. It is not impossible, but it is essentially improbable, that a powerful monarch, returning from a great and glorious expedition, should be murdered by his wife and her paramour, and that the murderers should not only escape immediate punishment, but should usurp the throne and establish themselves in possession. It would be much in such a case if the guilty pair could save themselves by a prompt flight from the vengeance of the triumphant husband. That in the very moment of his new strength and prestige they should actually overthrow him and take his place is a thing which only under the most peculiarly favourable circumstances could either happen or seem credible. The first task therefore of a narrator, who for the sake of the striking situation should undertake to present such a story, must be to adopt such circumstances; and upon his skill in doing this his success, if he were a dramatist, must in the first instance largely depend. For however it may be with the student or the reader, a popular audience cares first of all for the story, and is not to be put off with

profundity of thought, or splendour of language, or sounding rhythm, or with all of these things together.

Now it will be allowed that in the *Agamemnon*, as commonly read, the mechanism of the story has received from the author no consideration at all. According to Aeschylus, it would seem that for an adulteress to kill her king and husband on a day of triumph, and to raise her paramour to the throne, is an enterprise too plainly facile to require any explanation of the means. Of course the returning monarch will have no suspicions and receive no warning; of course, however abruptly he may arrive, he will find all prepared for the deed; of course when he has fallen, any slight mutiny on the part of his soldiers or subjects will be instantly and easily suppressed. But that Aeschylus should have been content to treat the matter thus is remarkable, not only upon general considerations of theatrical art, but for two more particular reasons. It is odd that if he really did not care, and did not expect any one to care, how the events came about, he should become scrupulous in explanation just at the point where the story is simplest, at the actual striking of the murderous stroke. If, in defiance of likelihood, we once suppose the king to walk ignorant and unsuspicious into the palace where, to the knowledge of his faithful servants and subjects[1], his queen is living in adultery, we can imagine a hundred ways in which the wife, if so minded, might compass his death. Yet the poet exactly describes the very peculiar device by which the murderess made sure that her victim should have, as she says, 'neither defence nor escape' (*v.* 1380). Strange that he should have regarded this, and disregarded the only real and pressing questions, how she got her chance and how she secured her impunity! And again, even if the tragedian did not observe for himself that in such a case the preparatory conditions must be a vital part of the plot, it is odd that he should not have recognized this, when it had been emphasized long before by the original narrators of the story

The version of the legend current at the date of the *Odyssey* is there given incidentally several times[2]. According to this, Aegisthus, the lover of Clytaemnestra, wooed her during the absence of Agamemnon, and with much difficulty induced her to quit the house of her husband for his own. Upon the return of the king, Aegisthus bade him to a feast, and there treacherously fell upon him and slew him, Clytaemnestra

[1] *vv.* 37, 620, etc.

[2] *Od.* 1. 35 foll., 3. 247 foll., 4. 512 foll., 11. 405 foll.

assisting. The narration given in Book XI by the ghost of Agamemnon also introduces the presence and death of the captive Cassandra. Now we have but to read these references to see at once, that the epic poets in their construction of the story were principally occupied with the question, how such a thing could possibly come about, how the king could arrive at the house of Aegisthus uninformed of his wife's infidelity, and why his death was not prevented or instantly avenged by his companions in arms. The two most elaborate recitals, those in the Third and the Fourth Book, relate almost entirely to these points; and in the Third Book the problem is formally propounded. 'How' asks Telemachus of Nestor very pertinently 'was the imperial Agamemnon slain? Where was Menelaus? And by what cunning did Aegisthus contrive the death of one far mightier than himself?' The first question, how the king came to be at the moment comparatively helpless, is thereupon answered by Nestor, who relates how a storm divided and in great part destroyed the returning host. Of this we need say little now, as this part of the story is adopted by Aeschylus and will appear presently in its place. The second and principal question, what means Aegisthus used and how they came to be successful, is answered by the narrative of Proteus in the Fourth Book. There we learn that Aegisthus after the seduction, lest Agamemnon should reach home unobserved and learning the facts should fall upon the seducer by surprise, set a watch to look out for him, whose vigilance was prompted by a great bribe. He continued to watch for a year before the king returned, when an accident rewarded this precaution with undesigned and extraordinary success. The same storm, which scattered the fleet, so carried the king's ship out of its course, that he was thankful to land not at home but upon Aegisthus' domain, near the very castle to which he had carried Clytaemnestra. (It is plain that in the circumstances supposed by Homer this accident offers the only condition under which Agamemnon could possibly be taken unawares.) Aegisthus, apprised by his watchman and seizing the opportunity, invited the king and his companions to a pretended feast of welcome, at which they were treacherously slain. It is noteworthy that the bard, so full is he of the feeling that to fall upon the veterans of Troy, with whatever advantage, was a hazardous feat, after saying that not one of the king's followers was left, adds grimly that not one of the assassins was left either.

Now between Homer and Aeschylus the story, as we see, has essentially changed. In Aeschylus the murder takes place at the king's house, where the queen is still ruling, and it is she who plays the deceptive part. Much has been said, and much that is true, on the moral and

spiritual aspects of this change, and on the motives of this kind which would commend it to the tragedian[1]. But there were also other reasons simpler and more imperative, why the Homeric version should not have been followed entirely by subsequent narrators, and especially upon the Athenian stage. Without a strong effort of historic imagination, such as no dramatist would willingly require of a popular audience, the Homeric tale could not have been realised. It might pass very well in the antique and consecrated epic, but to expose it in an unfamiliar dress to the 'faithful witness of the eye' would have been in the days of Aeschylus a bold effort indeed. The Homeric story demands for its reception the Homeric mind, and that in two respects. First, in the supposed condition of society and, if the word is applicable, of politics. As conceived by the bard, the whole issue lies between the households and retainers of two chieftains. The lady of Agamemnon leaves her husband's castle for that of Aegisthus. Between the two families this is a deadly breach, but there the rupture ends. What would become of Agamemnon's government upon the flight of his imperial regent, and how the state and the people would be affected and behave, are question which do not arise, simply because among the independent nobles, to whom the story was sung, no such questions would actually have arisen. But how should they not suggest themselves, if the story was to be presented visibly and in modernized language before a great democracy, to whom the administration of government was a daily familiar problem? And secondly, the epic tale depends still more strictly and necessarily upon the primitive isolation of places. To the bard and his hearers it seemed natural, or at any rate within the license of fiction, that Clytaemnestra in the Peloponnese should have been living for a year in the house of her lover, and that her husband should still return from the Troad ignorant of anything wrong. And the audience of Homer might very well think so. With such communication between the places as they knew, they might well suppose that an expedition sent from Argos to Troy, if such a thing were to be imagined, would for the time be totally cut off from home and news of home. But how was this to pass in the middle of the fifth century? Would the mass of Athenian spectators, accustomed to hear news from Sigeum every week, readily conceive this situation, and was it worth while to risk anything upon their readiness? Aeschylus at any rate makes no such attempt. On the contrary, by a natural compromise with the habitual ideas of his own time, he supposes such a possibility of communication

[1] See for example the excellent introduction to Enger's edition.

between Troy and Argos that sometimes the very ashes of the dead were sent home for burial[1]. It is needless to look further for reasons why he should not have placed the queen in the house of Aegisthus; and the same reflexion, we may add, should make us very slow to assume, as we commonly do, that he has placed Aegisthus in the palace or even in the realm of Clytaemnestra.

Aeschylus then, or the predecessors whom he followed, in adapting the Homeric tradition to the expectations of their public, could not but drop the incident upon which in Homer the whole mechanism of the story depends. But neither surely could they drop it without compensation. The story of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra is essentially the story of a daring venture, which against all probability and by the favour of circumstances succeeded. The epic bard, after the fashion expected of him, provides the circumstances. With the change of manners and knowledge this fashion became unsuitable; and the difficulty of saving the situation at all was increased in many ways too obvious to be specified. The problem then standing thus, how does the Aeschylean narrative deal with it? The Homeric solution being discarded, what solution does Aeschylus provide? Absolutely, if we are to accept the interpretation of the Byzantine critics, no solution or attempted solution at all. It is hard to say whether the story, as they would reconstruct it, is more amazing in what it affirms or in what it ignores. To the question, the inevitable question, of the Homeric Telemachus, '*How* was the imperial Agamemnon slain, and by what cunning device was he overpowered?' the answer of Aeschylus, we are to understand, would have been this, 'Clytaemnestra entangled him in a bath-drapery made for the purpose'!

We will now rapidly follow the action, from the point where we left it to pursue this criticism. Our difficulties will not disappear or diminish as we proceed. It is true that all that part of the drama which lies between the entrance of Agamemnon and the entrance of Aegisthus, though perplexing in the highest degree if considered in connexion with what precedes or in reference to the unprovided requirements of the situation, does not offer, if taken by itself, any obstacle sufficient to mar its magnificent and astounding effect. The exit of the king, the whole part of Cassandra, the whole scene between the queen and the elders after the murder are such as it would be impertinent to praise. Upon this part of the play, something less than half of it, regarded practically as an independent piece, now reposes

[1] *v.* 448; see also *v.* 855 foll.

the whole reputation of the drama considered as a drama. Indeed the author of the Greek Introduction in the MS., whose ideas respecting the plot as a whole we are content to borrow, is on this point candid enough. 'This part of the play', he coolly says, after describing the exit of the king and of Cassandra, 'is admired as astonishing and very pathetic'. It would be easy to show that this significant *expressio unius* represents also the opinion of the moderns, and that, notwithstanding the rich beauties of the whole, every one more or less openly wonders, why the magnificent central picture and the exquisitely carven frame should be so ill fitted to each other.

For with the entrance of Aegisthus the difficulty begins again. It even becomes so great that it cannot be tolerated, and the knot has to be cut by change of the text. Nowhere is it more apparent than in the finale, how much the dramatist relied for the exposition of the story upon the visible action and upon the previous knowledge of the spectators, how imperfect as a narrative are the mere speeches and odes by themselves, and how serious a task for us, who have neither stage-directions nor authoritative preface, is the reconstruction of the indispensable remainder. We find Aegisthus speaking upon the stage; but how he comes there, where he comes from, and how his appearance is connected with the action up to this point, are questions not to be answered by the mere perusal of what is said. So much however is plain (and admitted), that language is used which cannot be reconciled with the current conception of the story. According to Aeschylus, it is supposed, the overthrow of Agamemnon is entirely the work of Clytaemnestra. Her paramour, being, as the Argives tell him, a dastard, remains hidden in the palace or neighbourhood, and appears only to exult when the deed is done. (Why he should have run the enormous risk of being there at all, if he had no part to play, and whether his conduct is not even more foolish than cowardly, are questions which might occur to us in passing.) But this being so, it is strange that Aegisthus should not only attribute the success to himself, but applaud himself vehemently for the ingenuity by which it was attained: and it passes comprehension that the Argive elders should take him at his own valuation as the principal agent, and should speak of the queen, the sole agent, as having merely 'joined in' the plan. 'It was I', says Aegisthus, 'who combined and contrived all the difficult plot[1]'. What plot? There is no plot. There is no combination or contrivance at all. The king comes to his palace, the queen (how could she less?)

[1] *vv.* 1604—1609.

pretending to welcome him. His first act, as a matter of course, is to take the accustomed lustral bath preparatory to sacrifice. The queen, attending him, envelopes him after the bath with an entangling drapery provided for the occasion, and then in this helpless condition butchers him with an axe. Where is the contrivance? The peculiar drapery? Truly a most ingenious combination. Is it not obvious that if we ignore all the real difficulties of the enterprise, if we suppose the king to arrive uninformed and unsuspicious in the kingdom where his queen had long entertained his bitterest foe, if we suppose that a victorious general had no friends in the country willing or able to avenge him, the actual killing might be done by anybody at almost any time and without the slightest difficulty? That his wife should slay him at the lustration, and should have his drapery so made as to entangle him, might show in her a fiendish cruelty and a cold-blooded precaution; but would he have lived and prospered if the drapery had been of the common make? Truly a profound and an admirable combination!

Yet the Argive elders are quite satisfied. They at once recognize Aegisthus as the contriver and prime agent of the scheme, and all they have to ask is, why then he did not act without the queen. 'Why, as it was thy plot, why, coward, didst thou not do the butchery alone? Why join his wife with thee? Why, to the defilement of our land and our gods, must she be his murderer[1]?'

> *τί δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ᾽ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς*
> *οὐκ αὐτὸς ἠνάριζες, ἀλλὰ σὺν γυνή,*
> *χώρας μίασμα καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων,*
> *ἔκτεινε;*

And here no disguise is possible. Every one sees that this language, with the emphatic *σύν*, is not such as could reasonably be addressed to one who had merely lain by, while the wife directed and performed the whole. Accordingly *σύν* is condemned as an error, to be replaced by *σοι*, *νιν*, or other palliatives[2]. We will not here stop to discuss this device, nor will we go further, as might be done, in pressing the acknowledged difficulties which affect the received exposition of the drama as a whole. Sufficient, in my judgment, has been said to show that the text, as it remains to us, without the explanations furnished to the audience by the action upon the stage and by the current version of

[1] *vv.* 1633—1646.

[2] It is worth notice that we have the authority of the *Venetus* as well as the *Florentinus* for *σύν*, which was therefore almost certainly in the *Mediceus*. That it should have been wrongly inserted by a copyist is technically improbable.

the story, which they previously knew, presents a difficult problem, to be solved, if at all, by the reconstruction of the action and of the story which Aeschylus presupposed as known, and that as a solution of this problem the hypothesis of the ancient editors is unworthy of consideration, that it is in fact no solution whatever. It does not give a rational account of the facts or make the purpose of the author intelligible. We will turn rather to the positive and perhaps more fruitful side of the enquiry.

As a preliminary we will notice two or three salient points, which may serve to indicate the direction in which we should strike off. The first of these indications meets us, as if placed for the purpose (and indeed it is) at the very threshold of the play. The watchman upon the palace-roof, whose duty it is to look for the beacon announcing the fall of Troy, informs us in his first words that this outlook has been kept nightly *for a year*. Why for a year? Are we to understand that, when the war had already run eight or nine years, the king and queen, having hitherto thought the ordinary communications sufficient, suddenly established the beacons? It cannot be by accident that this 'year-long watch' exactly reproduces one feature in the story of Homer[1]. In Homer the watchman of Aegisthus had been expecting Agamemnon 'for a year'. These words of Aeschylus, compared with the epic narrative, are in themselves enough to suggest and almost to raise a presumption, that in the Aeschylean narrative also the design of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra had been on foot for a year, and that the outlook kept by the watchman was closely connected with this design.

And for a second guiding-line, let us look again at the very remarkable speech of the queen which follows her description of the beacons and shortly precedes the entry of Agamemnon's herald[2]. It is remarkable, as already observed, as directing our attention to the fact that, if the preceding story be true, the Greeks must be still in Troy. It is even more remarkable as showing, on the part of Clytaemnestra, a power of unconscious divination which Cassandra might have envied. She makes, it is true, the very natural mistake of supposing that the Greeks are in Troy; but on the other hand how wonderfully does she forecast the rest of their story! Except that she does not anticipate (small blame to her prophecy) the compression of the events into one night, her divination is perfect. She fears that the Greek army, not content with their legitimate triumph, may be tempted to plunder the sacred treasures of Troy. They have actually done so. She points out that

[1] *Od.* 4. 526. [2] *v.* 332.

such impiety might expose them to the chastisement of the gods in the course of the voyage home. They have actually suffered such a chastisement. The queen, in short, knows so much that it becomes an interesting enquiry how much exactly she knows, and what is the source of her knowledge.

And for the third indication let us turn to the continuation of the story, to the moment in the *Choephori*, when Orestes has entered the palace to execute his vengeance, when the murderers of Agamemnon are about 'to be slain by stratagem even as they slew[1]'. It is thus that the chorus, expectant without, sum up the issue to be decided. 'Now either shall the bloody violence of the murderous *axes* make an end utterly and altogether of Agamemnon's house: or else Orestes, *burning a fire and a light for liberation and lawful rule*, shall win again the high prosperity of his fathers'. It is plain that in the first part of the alternative the metaphor of the axes is chosen for its reference to the manner of Agamemnon's death. What was it that suggested in the second alternative the choice of the far from obvious metaphor of a fire? Certainly nothing in the plan of Orestes himself as given us in the *Choephori*. Is it not at least a fair *prima facie* conjecture that this also refers to the former plan of his enemies; and that the restoration of the lawful monarchy is likened to the lighting of a fire for liberty, because by the lighting of a fire for tyranny it had been formerly overthrown? But if this is so, we must revise our reading of the *Agamemnon*.

Setting out upon the line thus indicated we might proceed in two ways. Either we might re-examine the play throughout and draw at each point conclusions as to the facts or the dramatic *action*, as distinct from the mere words, which the text assumes. Or, anticipating the conclusion, we may first sketch the story continuously, as we suppose it might have been told in outline, before the play was performed, by any one who knew the version current at the time in Athens, and may then justify our 'hypothesis' by explaining from it the construction of the play. We will take rather the second way, as putting the narrative and the dramatic version in their true order, and will begin with a hypothetical narrative. But in doing this we shall not attempt a distinction, for which there are no materials, between the general outline which the poet took from current literature and the minor details which he may have introduced himself.

[1] *Cho.* 853; see also *ib.* 887.

2. *The Narrative.*

By Divine Providence it is appointed that sin shall tend to make more sin, and in the end that sin shall bring forth punishment. The fall of Agamemnon was the consequence of the sin of his father, seconded in its effect by further sin of his own. His father Atreus, by a horrible crime, brought upon his family an unappeasable enmity and the curse of heaven. Divine interference, punishing this crime in the son, exposed him to a temptation which he had not the virtue to resist. His sin provoked another enmity personal to himself, to reinforce the enmity bequeathed by his father, and the two joined together for his ruin.

The starting-point of the story is the Thyestean feast. Thyestes, brother of Atreus, having corrupted his wife and disputed his throne, and having been banished from Argos, endeavoured by throwing himself upon his brother's mercy to obtain restoration. Atreus pretended to welcome him and to celebrate his return by a feast, at which two of Thyestes' children were served as food to their father, and he was made to eat of it unawares. Thyestes, in the agony of the discovery, devoted the accursed house 'to perish in like manner', overturning the table with his foot as a symbol of his prayer. With his remaining child, Aegisthus, he was then sent again into banishment.

Upon Agamemnon, the son of Atreus, who with his brother Menelaus succeeded to the throne, the curse began to work its effect on the occasion of the expedition to Troy. The anger of heaven against the family delayed with contrary winds the assembled fleet[1], until the seers suggested to the kings as a propitiation the sacrifice of Agamemnon's daughter, Iphigenia. To this wicked act the father at last consented, and from this time was pursued by the hatred of his wife Clytaemnestra as well as that of the still-banished Aegisthus. During the expedition Argos was governed by Clytaemnestra, supported by those elders who necessarily remained at home.

Where Aegisthus was spending his exile, and at what time he first conceived that in the absence of the king and the wrath of the queen he might find the opportunity of restoration and revenge, we do not learn, nor is it material. It is implied that he did visit Argos, not of course openly, and so prevailed with the queen, that she was ready to be his accomplice, if occasion served. With many dramatists, with Euripides for example, it would have been a main point in such a

[1] See on *vv.* 139—144.

situation to show precisely how, in the union of Agamemnon's enemies, Love and Hatred became conspirators—

ξυνώμοσαν γάρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρίν.

But the analysis of the passions was no part of the Aeschylean drama, and the apportionment of the two motives is left undetermined, the less intimate and sentimental being placed in the foreground.

But the guilty coalition of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra was so far from securing the punishment of their common enemy, that it was scarcely so much as a step towards it. It is needless to enquire, and perhaps the poet could scarcely have told us, exactly what institutions he represented to himself as the 'free and lawful government' of ancient Argos[1]. Doubtless some such limited monarchy, supported and balanced by the influence of privileged councillors and by the popular will, as the Athenians attributed to their own Theseus, such as their stage exhibits, for example, in the *Oedipus at Colonus*, and as their historian asserts to have been the primitive model all over Hellas[2]. But at any rate in no state, not even the rudest despotism,—and that the Argos of this drama is not a despotism, we are expressly told[3]—could the alliance of the queen-regent with a broken exile give her the power, any more than the right, to assail with impunity the person or throne of the monarch, whether present or absent, so long as his subjects were loyal to him. A speedy success at Troy and a triumphant return would have made Agamemnon safe. But the vengeance of Heaven was not to be thus eluded. At the setting forth of the army it was prophesied, that though for the sin of Paris Troy was destined to fall, yet by the evil genius of the Atridae her fall should be long delayed[4]. It was the length of the war which wrought the king's ruin, and made at last an opening through which his enemies struck home.

In two ways marked by the dramatist the authority of the royal brothers in Argos was shaken by this protracted contest. First, by the mere change of persons. The departing army left behind them those too old for war and those too young, the elders and the boys. During the ten years the elders were passing away or sinking into dotage, the boys were growing up, and all to the disadvantage of the house of Atreus. Among the elders naturally were to be found most personal devotion to the princes and most attachment to established power. It is this party, if we may so call them, Agamemnon's natural friends and

[1] *ἐλευθερία ἀρχαί τε πολισσονόμοι*, *Cho.* 863. See also *Ag.* 835 foll.
[2] Thuc. I. 13 *ἦσαν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς γέρασι πατρικαὶ βασιλεῖαι.*
[3] *v.* 1353. [4] *vv.* 125—145.

councillors, which is represented by the feeble and anxious remnant, who form the principal chorus of the play: and the poet has spared no pains to expose their weakness[1]. As we shall see, the very crisis of the action turns upon their inevitable defect in quickness, decision, and courage. Meanwhile the generation coming up was far from compensating in loyalty for the generation going down. As more and more lives were sacrificed to the revenge of Menelaus, discontent grew deeper and wider; until at last, before the end came, the friends of the king, seeing the course of affairs, yet not daring to interfere, acknowledged to themselves that all was ripe for an outbreak against the government. Powerless already, they lived in constant fear of some dark design, and began to look with desperate eagerness for the king's return[2].

Meanwhile the queen and the partner of her guilt were using and aiding the natural course of events. How much the king's friends knew, or how much they suspected, of the queen's unfaithfulness, the dramatist nowhere determines, nor would anything have been gained dramatically, but much lost, by doing so. In such a case the question of moment is not so much what is known or suspected, but rather what cannot be ignored and therefore is publicly acknowledged. It is plain from the whole course of the play that the correspondence and intimacy of Clytaemnestra with Aegisthus was, when Agamemnon returned, still a secret, not an open scandal[3]. Upon any other supposition the behaviour of the elders, the king's devoted subjects, towards the queen in the early part of the play and towards the king at his coming, is inconceivable, and indeed the whole story is palpably impossible. We are directed to suppose that by the end of the war the repute of Clytaemnestra had reached that only too familiar stage, when a wife's adultery is known to every one and proclaimed by no one, and when those know least or speak least of it who are most nearly interested, those who, expecting yet weakly dreading the discovery, still say to themselves with the Argive elders

πάλαι τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω.

Down to the day of the king's return Aegisthus was still nominally, as well as legally, a banished man, coming and going doubtless more and more frequently as the hopes of the exiles and the malcontents rose,

[1] *vv.* 72—83 and *passim*.

[2] *vv.* 437—480, and *vv.* 543—555, the first a passage of great importance, in which this part of the story is effectively summed up.

[3] 'Aegisthos und Klytämnestra schliessen zwar einen Bund, allein er muss, wenn die List gelingen soll, vor der Welt geheim gehalten werden'. Enger, *Einleitung*. This is perfectly true; but if Clytaemnestra had recalled from banishment her husband's hereditary enemy, what concealment could any longer be pretended?

while the other side still maintained the politic fiction of his absence. On the fatal morning itself he was actually not in the Argolid. Where he was, and where for a long while past he had spent the intervals between his visits, the story is presently to discover. Meanwhile all that the loyal elders knew and acknowledged to themselves respecting the dangerous state of the popular mind was naturally transmitted to their master[1]. Nor was it possible but that with these reports a messenger less discreet or more courageous than the rest should sometimes whisper a more dark insinuation. Both the knowledge and the suspicion thus communicated determine, and are necessary to account for, the language held by Agamemnon during his brief appearance before the palace-gate.

But the fears of the seniors would have been much more cruel, and their representations more outspoken, if they had known but half the truth. They perceived that the common indignation against the war offered a ready bond for a conspiracy[2]; they were not aware that the fiercer spirits were already bound in a plot, and waited only to determine by circumstances how and when they should strike. To explain the sequel we will state so much as the story presumes to be known respecting the geography of the place. The Argolid or πόλις Ἄργους is a plain opening southwards upon a deep bay of the sea, and enclosed on the other sides by mountains. The mountains to the N.-E. of the plain are continued southwards in a great promontory forming the eastern side of the bay, and northwards into a mass of hills which extends as far as the Isthmus of Corinth. This whole chain was a lonely region, and had an evil reputation in legend and fact as a haunt of outlaws and robbers[3]. Nearest to the fortified seat of the Atridae[4], lay Mount Arachnaeus, the *Spider-Mountain*, whose quaint name suggested more than one fanciful application, and not improbably gave the first hint for the story which Aeschylus followed[5]. Here, amid the web of hills and spurs, upon the edge of the forbidden land, lay Aegisthus in hiding with such power as he could make, and fed himself, as he tells us, with the exile's bread of expectation[6]. Here

[1] *v.* 821. [2] *v.* 463.

[3] See the story of Theseus and Periphetes.

[4] See a note on the Argos of the dramatists by Prof. Mahaffy, *Rambles in Greece*, chap. XIII. p. 355. It does not however appear in this play precisely where the 'fortress' is to be figured, whether at the historical city of Argos, or at Mycenae, or elsewhere. An Athenian audience, as appears very clearly in the opening of Sophocles' *Electra*, would not be punctilious on such a point. My language here in the first edition was too definite.

[5] See the twice repeated *v.* 1493, and note.

[6] *v.* 1668.

was the fittest place from which to watch the communications of Argos by sea and land with the army in the far east; and hence it was easy, when the moment should come, to signal either by day or by night to his partizans in the castle and throughout the country. Supposing all for the best, a hard enough task lay still before him.

For it would have been madness to assume that because the Argives murmured against the absent princes, and because, while appearances were kept up, the malcontents seemed a formidable number, therefore all, or a majority, were ready to stand by while the queen disowned her husband and proclaimed her lover. In such a situation the very best restorative to loyalty is that the lawful authority should be assailed by violence one minute too soon. And so foul a treachery as that of Clytaemnestra must arm against it not only all those whose disaffection had spent itself in hot words, but every honest man. Only with the advantage of surprise and stratagem could her cause be won by such and so many as would support it when once proclaimed. The key to the country was its 'sole fortress', the city or rather the castle of the Atridae[1]. To put it into the hands of the traitors would with some management not be difficult. But of what use was this, if the king were thereupon to return armed with all the strength of Achaia and of Hellas? Plainly the ultimate success or failure of Aegisthus must turn on the question whether Agamemnon came back, and in what circumstances he came. Meanwhile the conspirators resolved at least not to be surprised. The seas were carefully scanned (with what result hereafter appears); and that communication might be instantly opened, if necessary, between the principals, a watchman upon the palace kept outlook every night for a beacon upon the Mountain of the Spider[2]. Here a small difficulty had to be overcome. The servants of Agamemnon's household were devoted to their master. None of them could be trusted. Yet to introduce a stranger for such a special service would have attracted suspicion at once. Accordingly Clytaemnestra chose among the servants a fellow as simple as loyal, and, to explain to him his employment, pretended to be expecting a beacon-signal announcing the king's success. His vigilance and silence were secured by threats and bribes. This arrangement was maintained during the

[1] *v.* 267.

[2] For some interesting remarks on this part of the story see *Classical Review* II. 98. Prof. Platt observes truly that the Watchman, if the conspirators had, as must be supposed, other means of information, is no longer, as in Homer (see above) a necessary figure in the mechanism, though it is perhaps going too far to call him an inconsistent figure. He may, as Prof. Platt says, be regarded as a survival from the Homeric version, such as are found in all stories transplanted to new settings.

whole last year of the king's absence. The watchman, impatient of his task and disposed to regard it as an absurd effect of feminine eagerness or imagination, was for this very reason the less disposed to talk of it, and had never connected it, as he had no apparent reason to do, with that conviction about his mistress which he shared with the rest of the world[1].

Such was the situation in Argos, when 'about the setting of the Pleiads', by our calendar in the month of November, Troy was at last taken[2]. The occurrence of the event at this season was the beginning of the conspirators' good fortune. The seas were closed. Even in the historic times of ancient Hellas few voyages were undertaken in the winter; and according to poetical tradition no one after the 'setting of the Pleiads' expected to sail at all. Ordinary communication being thus suspended, the party preparing for the attack had the full advantage of their preparation. What precisely were their arrangements for obtaining information respecting the army does not appear in the play, nor was it at all necessary (the story being known) that it should. There would be no insuperable difficulty in getting information, when to be the first informed was a matter of life or death. To bring any exhibition of the means within the time covered by the action upon the stage would have been difficult, and useless. For the purpose of the play it suffices that information was obtained: and this much is exhibited clearly enough. We have already seen that Clytaemnestra, at the very moment of receiving, as she pretends, the first news of the triumph, is acquainted not only with the outrages since committed in Troy by the victorious army, but with the disaster at sea which they have suffered in consequence[3].

Once more, the reckless and cruel pride of Agamemnon had betrayed him to his ruin. Not content with the stern vengeance which the justice of Hellenic war would have sanctioned, he had utterly ravaged and literally destroyed the captive city, sparing not even the sacred places[4]. It was probably not unnoticed by the narrator, that by this brutality and sacrilege the Greek army also destroyed the last possibility of remaining where they were till a more favourable season, and forced themselves to tempt the risks of the winter passage even while they forfeited the

[1] See the prologue, in which the relevant points in the situation of the Watchman are given with skill and force.

[2] *v.* 817.

[3] *vv.* 332—362.

[4] *vv.* 353 foll., 530 foll. etc. The attribution of these sentiments to heroic antiquity is of course an anachronism; and the Herald is made by Aeschylus to express contrary sentiments, but in such a way as to condemn them even while he utters.

protection of heaven. The neighbouring country they had already eaten up[1]. They set sail at any rate, and fared as they had deserved. One fearful night of storm scattered the armament to the winds: and at sunrise the 'destroyer of Ilium' found himself, like Xerxes at sunset, 'a sovereign of the seas without a fleet[2]'.

By this disaster the cause of the conspirators, hitherto almost desperate, was advanced to a fair chance of success. But the final enterprise was still very perilous. The king might have escaped. If he returned, the queen and her lover could triumph only by destroying him, which, if they declared themselves before he came, they would certainly not do without a bloody and doubtful contest against his veteran soldiers and those who would rally round his person. Completing therefore their plans to suit the new situation they waited still a short while for the event. When the moment should arrive, the signal from Mount Arachnaeus was to announce to those in the secret that their accomplices were ready. Fortune stood by them still, so far at least as that the king's ship, which by what seemed a happy miracle had survived the storm, was the first of the survivors to reach Argos. Still more propitious was the hour of arrival. It was in the dead of the winter night that this remnant of the great host came into the bay[3]. By none but those in the plot was such an arrival expected, and they only were upon the watch. The news of the king's approach was instantly carried to the neighbouring eastern hills, and it was still night when the watchman from the palace saw the beacon upon Mount Arachnaeus, and carried to his mistress the news, as he supposed, that Troy had fallen, in reality that the king had come, that Aegisthus was ready, and that she and their partizans throughout the Argolid (for the light could be seen far and wide) were to act as had been pre-arranged[4].

[1] *v.* 133. [2] *v.* 1226.

[3] The story named the very night. It was the last of the year. That this was so will be seen by comparing the language of the watchman at the opening with the expression of the herald at his first entrance, δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τῷδ' ἀφικόμην ἔτους *on this tenth dawn of a year* (*v.* 509). It is an addition to the picturesque impressiveness of the circumstances that the day of the murder was a specially solemn day of religious rejoicing. Clytaemnestra also remembers the season, when she compares the return of a husband to the relief of a beneficent change in the weather (*vv.* 957—963). It will be noticed that, while the other seasons are cited in the aorist tense of generality and associated with husbands in general, the 'coming in winter' is referred to Agamemnon personally and described in the present tense. The interval between the fall of Troy and the arrival would thus be something over a month, not at all too much for the repose of the army, the destruction of the city, the preparations for departure, the voyage up to the storm, and the bringing of the king's 'bare hull' from the point to which it was carried back to Argos.

[4] The arrangement of the circumstances here is exceedingly skilful. The

The plot now to be executed had three objects, all familiar in the perpetual conspiracies and revolutions of Hellas, first to separate the king from his soldiers and murder him, before his friends could repair to him or open his eyes; secondly to secure the fortress; and thirdly to capture the principal persons of the loyal party. Given the extraordinary circumstances, this was now a hopeful project, though, as the sequel shows, by no means certain yet. Upon the report of the signal the queen at once sent out messengers announcing that she had received great news, and ordering a general feast in honour of the occasion, thus quieting and diverting the minds of all who were not better informed. At the same time she summoned the king's chief friends, the elders of the city, who in their anxiety at this nocturnal alarm and their eagerness for explanation were but too ready to come[1]. On reaching the fortress and the place of council, which lay as usual before the palace doors[2], they waited for some time, as the queen, whose object was to detain and to mystify them for the necessary interval, was in no hurry to satisfy their curiosity. It was day-break when at length she appeared and in answer to their enquiry as to her news informed them that Troy had fallen that very night. It had been foreseen that some explanation must be offered, and this particular falsehood had the double advantage of tallying with the belief of the watchman and of removing all apparent need for immediate action of any kind. One question could not be escaped, by what means the intelligence had come; and the queen, with an eloquence which might almost persuade her auditors, traced for them the imaginary links between the visible beacon on Mount Arachnaeus and the king's beacon upon Mount Ida at Troy[3]. It is true that in fabricating this story she betrayed a misconception of the region described, such as might be expected in a queen of Argos in the heroic times. Nor were her auditors contented. Though they

one chance for Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra was that they should strike *immediately* on the king's arrival. Every hour that he passed in communication with his subjects must make the queen's position more perilous and her success more improbable. It is manifest that the situation given by Aeschylus is just one, perhaps the only one, in which by vigilance the conspirators might have several hours of clear advantage. The dramatist probably assumed, as he does in the *Supplices*, that the landing-place for 'Argos' was in ancient times uninhabited.

[1] *v.* 270 implies that the elders had been sent for. But to repair to the castle would (as they say *v.* 267) have been their impulse. It is evident here and everywhere that, though suspecting or knowing the queen's infidelity, they have not the least glimpse of her treason.

[2] *v.* 523.

[3] Prof. Platt (article above cited) calls attention to the deceptive beacon of Nauplius as another incident of the Νόστοι, which may have suggested the attribution of this stratagem to Clytaemnestra.

had not sufficient knowledge to expose the fraud, the mere circumstances were such as inevitably to prompt suspicion. They tried to probe the evidence. But the queen had taken care to surround herself with some of those in her secret; and by their professions of belief and confidence she was enabled to evade enquiry[1]. She added a few words suitable to the supposed circumstances and withdrew.

All this time her partizans in the country, favoured by the darkness and their knowledge of the facts, were using their advantage. One party had hastened to the landing-place to receive the king and his companions, and were now already on their way thence to the castle, a distance of some miles, conducting him, his soldiers, and his captive Cassandra as in triumph[2]. Others were assembling in and at the fortress itself, while Aegisthus with his band was descending from the hills, ready to push forward at the last moment. It was no doubt one of the merits in the 'combination' upon which he prided himself, that personally he ran scarcely any risk at all, even in the event of failure, still quite possible, as was soon to be seen.

Left to their own reflexions, the seniors could not fail to perceive, even with such light as they had, the weakness of the evidence laid before them. They remembered the state of the country and felt vaguely uneasy. It was possible certainly that Troy was really taken, but much more likely, considering all things, that the queen was the victim of some imposture or delusion, which would soon be exposed[3]. They were in this mood when they perceived signs of the king's company approaching in the distance, and at the same moment arrived one who by his appearance seemed likely to know the truth. The king had sent forward a herald.

This incident, probable as it was and not to be prevented, was no part of the conspirators' design, and extremely dangerous to them. With the first words of the herald, the queen's whole story fell to the ground. Here was the crisis. If the elders had been sagacious, prompt, and bold, if, putting together all that they knew, they had argued from it to a remote consequence and acted instantly upon the inference, they and the king might perhaps yet have been saved. But criminal plots would seldom or never succeed, were it not for the weakness or error of those concerned to prevent them. And in this case the default was certainly pardonable. The queen could not be altogether

[1] *v.* 363.

[2] According to the Greek 'hypothesis', the king enters in a chariot, Cassandra and some of the spoil in a second chariot. This is possibly a genuine piece of theatrical tradition.

[3] *vv.* 481—493.

right, not right at all as to the beacon-message. But so the elders had already presumed. And what did it matter, when as to what seemed after all the main fact, she was now confirmed? Troy was really conquered; the king was come; and the queen's wild fancy about the beacon might well be perfectly innocent. If indeed they had had time first to consider and then to put questions! But the herald, mad with rapture, was in no mood to catch hints. While they were fumbling with vague suggestions of danger at home, he had darted off again upon the topic of his sufferings; and before they could recover the subject the queen was upon them and had promptly dismissed the herald with a message of welcome to his master[1].

The elders made indeed an effort to detain him by a question as to the safety of Menelaus, who had not been mentioned, a most unfortunate question, as the reply to it necessarily disclosed the destruction of the fleet, and by this news they were sufficiently distracted from more opportune reflexions until the king's arrival. The king arrived, with the companions of his voyage and their escort, and the success of the plot was almost assured.

The king arrived at the fortress, and his loyal friends saw with surprise, that the triumphant crowd by which he, his soldiers, and they were now surrounded, seemed to consist of the very men whom they had most reason to suppose disaffected. So striking was this, that even in the moment of welcome they could not but remark upon it resentfully, and warn the king not to be deceived by this show of unanimous rejoicing[2]. Agamemnon, putting their hint to previous reports[3], understood them perfectly. Indeed he had returned full of anger against his subjects and of suspicion against his wife, and spoke as if it had been his express object to aid the conspirators, by aggrieving any waverers among their party, or any loyalists who on the way from the sea to the castle had joined the company or were otherwise accidentally present.

[1] The brief conversation between the elders and the herald (*vv.* 543—555), the manner in which by their hesitation and his impatience the minute is lost, is an admirable stroke of dramatic art. Equally good is the dexterity and presence of mind shown by the queen at her re-entrance (*v.* 592). Here the slip of a word might have been fatal. If she referred to the supposed message from Troy, she risked refutation by the herald; if she was seen to avoid the subject, she ran still more risk from the suspicion of the elders. What she actually says is so adroitly turned, that while she seems to treat the matter with simple frankness, there is not a word which could suggest to the uninformed herald that there had been anything remarkable in her interpretation of the beacon which she mentions. To relish this kind of linguistic skill was a speciality of the Attic audience. It is the essence of their famous 'irony'.

[2] *vv.* 774—800.

[3] *v.* 821.

He and the gods of Argos had won a glorious triumph; but he had been ill served abroad and ill served at home, and so the offenders should find to their cost. Not a word of thanks, not a word, even after the wide-spread calamity just announced, of compassion[1]. Nothing could better lead up to the final stroke prepared by Clytaemnestra.

Advancing from the palace, she addressed her husband in a strain of extravagant and rapturous adulation, and then, bidding her attendants to strew rich tapestries over the approach, invited him to accept in the presence of the assembly the signs of that adoration which befitted the conqueror of Troy. Agamemnon, in great anger, replied to the address with a stern rebuke, and would gladly have escaped the malicious honour. But the queen by insistence and almost by violence compelled him to proceed, all the multitude beholding his act and many not aware of his reluctance. Thus with the symbol and show of an Asiatic tyrant did the victim of the new tyranny pass finally into the toils[2].

The fate of Cassandra, though of immense importance in the tragedy, not only for its own pathos but as giving another direction to the compassion which would otherwise have centred, contrary to the purpose, upon the murdered king, is to the mere machinery of the story insignificant[3]. She perished with her enslaver and possessor, whose death was now near and inevitable. When he had gone within, his soldiers departed or dispersed through the fortress, and the throng broke up. But the elders, already unconscious prisoners, had no mind to go away. The strange events of the morning had produced in them, though they could not seize the clue, a vague but invincible sense of danger. Already repenting their reticence and consoling themselves as best they could with the hope of the feeble that 'something will intervene', they waited in perplexity to see what would happen[4].

[1] *vv.* 801—845.

[2] Surely it is impossible to reconcile this scene with the supposition, that Agamemnon had no suspicion of his wife's honour. What other motive could explain his brutality? He gives her no greeting, he will not even mention her title or her name. His language is full of insinuation. It is the daring and above all the resources of Clytaemnestra, which are unsuspected by Agamemnon, not her unfaithfulness. The sarcastic ἀπουσίᾳ μὲν εἶπας εἰκότως ἐμῇ· μακρὰν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας, the husband's *sole* reply to his wife's affectionate greeting after a separation of ten years, is described by Enger as 'a mild reproof'. If this is mildness, what would be severity?

Whether in the end Agamemnon willingly consents to the use of the tapestry may be questioned. See Appendix R. My impression is that his mind is unchanged. The other view seems to prevail. But the question is of little importance. The tapestry is a mere detail, introduced chiefly for spectacular effect.

[3] See the last words of Cassandra (*vv.* 1326—1329), which expressly declare the part which she plays in the economy of the piece.

[4] *vv.* 966—1018. Perhaps no passage in the play is more completely irrecon-

What happened was this. In the palace the king found all in readiness both for sacrifice and lustration, for which preparation the festivities commanded in the morning had furnished a pretext[1]. He went, as custom commanded, to bathe before the ceremony. Clytaemnestra, eager for the delight of taking her revenge with her own hand, had marked for herself this moment. She had even descended to plan the details of the bath so as to increase the helplessness of the victim. There with an axe[2] she slew him, and his councillors, wrought by the agony of the foreseeing Cassandra to a paralysing terror, learnt his fate and theirs from his dying cry.

For now at last they began to realize the situation, and saw that the adulterers and their adherents had struck down not only the king, but with him the liberties of Argos[3]. Resistance was impossible. The fortress was in the hands of the conspirators, the remnant of the king's army entrapped and overpowered, the country surprised, and the loyal without a leader, the young heir Orestes being absent and the elders themselves in the power of the enemy. Among the people, between the victory and the loss of the fleet, more hearts had perhaps been lost than gained. Nay, the elders themselves were forced to confess that, of the chief conspirators, Clytaemnestra at least had a foul wrong and a presentable cause, nay, even that their own cause was not clear, for what had they done to save the innocent Iphigenia? To the name of Iphigenia the queen instantly appealed, and the councillors could not but allow that as between her, the mother, and them, in some sort the slayers, it was a doubtful case. Thus does Aeschylus moralize at once both the personal and the public aspects of his story[4].

But whatever compunction even the friends of Agamemnon might feel in the presence of Clytaemnestra gave way to pure rage when Aegisthus, entering the fortress with his ruffians and joining the queen where she stood with her defenders around her and the dead bodies at her feet, exulted in his 'just restoration' from exile[5] and boasted the

cilable with the current theory of the story than this. If Aegisthus is living, by the queen's permission, in Argos, what can the elders possibly mean by speaking of their 'inexplicable fears'? Obviously on this supposition the danger of Agamemnon must be imminent and certain, and the elders, who do not warn him, are in fact nothing less than accessories to his death.

[1] *vv.* 1040—41.

[2] On the weapon of Clytaemnestra see an essay by the late Prof. Warr, *Classical Review* XII. 348. Aeschylus seems to recognize both axe and sword, and probably follows a story in which both were actually employed.

[3] *v.* 1354, 1495—97, and the concluding scene *passim*.

[4] *vv.* 1410 foll., 1554—1560 etc.

[5] *v.* 1607. The language of Aegisthus here would of itself suffice to show that

skill with which he had conducted the successful design. At the sight of the mercenaries[1] the friends of liberty, inflamed to madness, would even have provoked their death there and then, and Aegisthus, cruel as cowardly, would have taken their challenge. But the queen, more politic as well as less base, would not suffer her hostages to be massacred. Prisoners however they remained[2], and thus, all power but that of the despots being dissolved, the land settled down under the adulterous tyranny until Orestes should come.

Thus, as the story was conceived at Athens in the fifth century, thus or somewhat thus was the imperial Agamemnon slain.

3. *The Structure of the Drama.*

We have now to show how the foregoing story, or a story like this in the main outline, was by Aeschylus shaped as a drama. The Byzantine story is condemned, first because it is absurd in itself, and next because, even if given, it still does not account for the construction and language of the play. The proof which we shall offer for the general truth (to no more than this ought any one in such a case to pretend) of our alternative hypothesis, is that it does explain and account for the drama with perfect simplicity.

But first it will be well to remind ourselves that it is a play of Aeschylus which we have before us, and to consider for a moment what Greek *drama* originally had been and, when Aeschylus took it in hand, was in its essence and main conception still. It is a familiar fact, that dialogue, the substance of a play as we conceive it, was first introduced into the drama by Aeschylus himself. Indeed to Aristophanes it seemed that the whole of 'tragedy', as a distinct style of literature, ought to be referred to Aeschylus as the first inventor[3]; and whatever the value of this opinion, which with our little evidence we should be slow to dispute, we know that the earliest rudiments of literary tragedy could be traced no higher than Aeschylus' immediate predecessors. But what was the stock upon which, whether by Aeschylus, by Phrynichus, or if it was so by Thespis, the literary tragedy was grafted? Whence came the name which was for some time bestowed upon the

he comes from abroad and now for the first time appears publicly in Argos.

[1] The character of Aegisthus' followers is sufficiently shown by *v.* 1638.

[2] *vv.* 1656, 1659.

[3] *ὦ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνὰ | καὶ κοσμήσας τραγικὸν λῆρον*, says the Chorus of the *Frogs* (1006).

whole? What was *drama*? For whoever may first have used the word *drama* in its present sense, neither Aeschylus nor Thespis invented, or is supposed to have invented, the thing. Drama, as the name implies, it not properly a form of written literature at all, but something far older and more natural. It is *action*, the presentation of a picture, fact, or story by movement and pantomime. It exists or has existed everywhere for ages without any literature at all, and has often attained a high development without even any regular verbal composition. When indeed literature takes possession of it, the literary element by its deeper interest and greater permanence will surely conquer the rest, and in Athens during the fifth century this process, like all others, went on with amazing rapidity, so that we soon arrive at a species of 'drama', such as the *Medea* of Euripides or the *Oedipus at Colonus* of Sophocles, which is not essentially an 'action' or performance at all, but a thing to be heard or read. The name in fact had already become, as it now notoriously is, a misnomer. But it was not a misnomer when it was given, and it is significant that the art which Aeschylus took up and turned into tragedy called itself 'performance' or 'action'. If we compare what was written, in ages when the book-drama was familiar, about the early dramatists of Athens, with what was said of them at the time when they were still remembered, we shall note a marked difference. We speak, and Suidas might have spoken, of Phrynichus as composing a tragedy on the taking of Miletus. But Herodotus does not say so. He says that he 'made a performance' or 'action' of it[1]. Aristophanes mentions Phrynichus often, and tells us that even in his own day the songs of Phrynichus were still the favourites of the older generation. But nowhere, I believe, does Aristophanes, or any one near that time, speak of the δράματα of Phrynichus as a kind of literature, which existed or could exist in a manuscript, like the *Andromeda* of Euripides, which Dionysus read on board ship before the battle of Arginusae[2]. He speaks of them as things which had been. 'Phrynichus', says Agathon to Mnesilochus in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, 'whose work you have yourself heard, was fine in person and fine in dress, and that is why his *actions* were fine too[3]'. Phrynichus, as he appears in the allusions of Aristophanes, is properly an artist in *pantomime*, inventor of gestures, figures, and movements, and author of popular songs; and the same character is given by all the first-hand evidence to the predecessors of Aeschylus.

Now as even the greatest innovator does not change everything in a

[1] 6. 21. [2] *Frogs* 53.

[3] *Thesm.* 167.

moment, it is important to remember all this when we come to the work of Aeschylus himself. When we speak of 'reading a drama' we are using an expression which to Aeschylus would probably have been unnatural. What lies before us is not the 'action' but the words that were to go with the action; and we have only to read them to see how much the manuscript implies which it does not directly express. Take for instance the *Seven against Thebes*, and read what the ancient editors offer as a list of the *dramatis personae*: 'Eteocles, Antigone, A spy, Ismene, Chorus of maidens, A herald.' These are the persons who speak or sing, and therefore attract the exclusive attention of the bookman, but they are a mere fraction of the performers required by the 'drama'. Besides the six champions who accompany Eteocles in the central scene, and without whose figures, dress, and behaviour the written dialogue could not be followed, we have a crowd of 'Cadmean citizens', upon whose playing, together with that of the maidens, would in performance depend the main effect both of the first scene and of the conclusion. It is they in fact, as much or more than the speakers, who conduct that 'action filled with the spirit of war' of which the Aristophanic Aeschylus speaks so proudly[1]. And this case is typical. The same applies in part to the *Choephori*, still more to the *Eumenides*, most of all to the *Supplices* and the *Persae*. In this last drama the poetry, for all its magnificence, is no more than a *libretto*. Except in the narrative of the battle, the literary element is nowhere independent and scarcely principal. The spectacular performance is the essence of the piece, of which a part, when divorced from the intended accessories, is scarcely readable. When Aeschylus in the *Frogs* vaunts himself to Dionysus upon the merits of the *Persae*, it is not the odes, the speeches, or even the thrilling narrative, which the name suggests to that typical representative of the Athenian theatre. What he recalls with pleasure is a striking pose of the performing company, a situation which has disappeared from the permanent literary form of the work, so that we actually do not now know where to place it[2]. In fact with the possible exception of the *Prometheus*, none of the extant plays of Aeschylus is a book-play, like the *Medea*, or the *Oedipus at Colonus*, or the dramatic poems of modern times. All are dramas proper, or representations in acting, and the *Agamemnon* is of the same type as the rest.

[1] δρᾶμα ποιήσας Ἄρεως μεστόν...τοὺς Ἑπτ' ἐπὶ Θήβας, *Frogs* 1021.

[2] *Frogs* 1027 ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα† περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος, ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τὼ χεῖρ' ὡδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν, ἰαυοῖ. There is some slight error in the text, but this is not here material.

Even long after the time of Aeschylus, when drama as a purely literary type was fully established, and hundreds of tragedies were composed with scarce a hope of performance[1], and when, as inevitably happened, the importance of the non-literary elements had relatively much declined, even then the part of the 'supers', to use the familiar term, was larger than a hasty reading of the text might lead us to suppose. I will give one striking example of this, where we are made more than commonly sensible of the stage 'crowd' by the fact that some of them, at a particular point in the action, are converted from mutes into singers. The scene in the *Hippolytus*, where the hero is denounced by Theseus, takes place, as the situation demands and the text shows, in the presence of many persons[2], servants of the king, friends of Hippolytus, and so forth. It is followed by an ode, sung not by women only like most of the odes preceding, but by men and women in response, a fact which by a mere accident is visible in the text. The *strophe* speaks in the masculine, the *antistrophe* in the feminine, the second *strophe* in the masculine again: the second *antistrophe* does not happen to give grammatical evidence of sex, but is proved feminine by its substance. The text runs thus[3]:

στρ. α΄. ἦ μέγα μοι τὰ θεῶν μελεδήμαθ᾽, ὅταν φρένας ἔλθῃ
λύπας παραιρεῖ· σύνεσιν δέ τιν᾽ ἐλπίδι κεύθων
λείπομαι ἔν τε τύχαις θνατῶν καὶ ἐν ἔργμασι λεύσσων κτλ.
ἀντ. α΄. εἴθε μοι εὐξαμένᾳ κτλ.
στρ. β΄. οὐκέτι γὰρ καθαρὰν φρέν᾽ ἔχω, τὰ παρ᾽ ἐλπίδα λεύσσων κτλ.

This alternation of gender admits but one reasonable explanation, that these singers are what they declare themselves, men and women respectively. And since the play has a chorus of men (*v.* 61) as well as a chorus of women, and an excellent opportunity has just occurred for bringing the men upon the stage as part of the crowd, the combination is quite simple. But the case is a good warning how easily we may miss the action in a text without supplemental directions. It is by mere chance that the language here betrays a change which is of no small dramatic importance[4].

[1] *Frogs* 90 τραγῳδίας ποιοῦντα πλεῖν ἢ μυρίας κτλ. It will be noticed that Aristophanes does not say δράματα. I believe he would even then have felt the word in this context to be impossible.

[2] Eur. *Hipp.* 1083, 1098.

[3] *ib.* 1102.

[4] The explanation of the *scholia*, that the masculine parts of the ode are spoken in the character of the poet, is more ingenious than rational. How could the same set of persons carry on a dialogue between themselves and another, and how should the author figure by this strange

And if this caution applies to the study of Euripides, it applies much more to Aeschylus. For between Aeschylus and Euripides, with the development of literary drama and the greater variety of written parts, the use of the mute players had much fallen off. 'In my plays' says the Aristophanean Euripides 'no one was left without a part; there were speeches for the lady, for the slave no less than the master, for the young girl and for the old woman too[1]'. This is of course an exaggeration. There are silent persons in Euripides, not a few; we have just seen an example, and any one of his plays will furnish others. But the text of the dramatists fully corroborates the remark of Aristophanes taken generally. The drama of Sophocles and Euripides is primarily a drama of speeches; the silent players are generally unimportant. There are few instances, perhaps none, in Sophocles or Euripides, of such figures as the judges in the *Eumenides* or the champions in the *Septem*, whose action is of the highest importance and upon whose persons and bearing the full attention of the audience is directed, while yet they have nothing to say. A writer who took much thought for readers would not be likely to introduce such parts. In Aeschylus, as his text and the observation of Aristophanes unite in showing, it was otherwise; and in the interpretation of Aeschylus we must add to the caution required by our imperfect knowledge of his story the further caution imposed by the fact that we have to supply the action, and that this supplement was a far more important matter with the 'inventor of tragedy' than with his more purely literary successors. Perhaps this consideration is too little regarded. No one can suppose that the plays of Aeschylus were performed entirely by the personages who speak and a 'chorus', in the modern sense of the word, who sang. The supposition is absolutely inconsistent with the texts. But the rest of the company, merged in the general and proper designation of χορός[2], receive little attention now that their action can no longer be seen and no stage-directions survive to represent it: and

deputation in his own play? The modern suggestion that the language in the masculine is 'more general' is scarcely true, and, if it were, would not explain why a woman should speak of herself in the masculine singular, or why the 'more general' and the 'more personal' language should alternate in strophe and antistrophe.—Mr Murray, in his recent text, divides the ode between the two *Chori* as above suggested, 1903.

[1] *Frogs* 948 ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐπῶν παρῆκ' ἂν οὐδέν' ἀργόν, ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνή τέ μοι κτλ. I give the reading of Lenting and Blaydes in preference to οὐδὲν παρῆκ' ἂν ἀργὸν MSS. The meaning in any case is the same, and is explained by the antithesis.

[2] We have no English term equivalent to the Greek χορός, which signifies 'a number of persons executing prescribed movements'.

this neglect, of little moment in the later poets, may well mislead us in the case of dramas composed when performance was still the main purpose and staple of the art. That there were not in some dramas of Aeschylus passages (if the word is applicable) of pure mime, of music and acting merely, such as are, or till very recently were, common upon the popular stage of Italy, is by no means clear: from Aristophanes, as well as from the probabilities of the case, we should rather suppose that there were such passages, nor is the text without confirming indications, as will in one case presently be seen. At all events the element of action was still essential, and the picture was still presented essentially by means of performance.

It is so presented in the *Agamemnon*. The 'plot' of the drama, a plot both in the theatrical and in the more familiar sense of the word, is performed before the audience: and we cannot properly read the written tragedy without figuring to ourselves that performance, separate from which it was never conceived by the author. The 'crowd', chiefly those partisans of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra without whose support their triumph would be visibly impossible, are naturally not for the most part provided with speeches, any more than the followers of Agamemnon, or the soldiers led by Aegisthus. But some of these persons, as representatives of them, do speak, and in three places at least, one very important, the mediaeval editors, by narrowing their conception of the χορός to the elders who sing the regular odes, have found and left pieces of the text unintelligible[1]. For the most part however their part is performance only, but that performance is necessary both to the picture and to the understanding of what is said. As in the foregoing story the action of the piece is anticipated, the formal description of it shall now be made as brief as possible. A list of the *dramatis personae* and a summary view of the divisions will be found in Appendix III.

The scene represents the palace of Agamemnon in the fortress of Argos. Before the entrance are statues of the gods, among them Zeus and Apollo, and the place of council with its seats. The time is night. A watchman is seen upon the roof. *Prologue* (1—39). The watchman explains the supposed purpose of his employment. The beacon appears and he gives the alarm within. He expresses his

[1] *vv.* 363, 618—621, 1522—1523. See also *vv.* 506, 631, 1649—1653.—It was also suggested, as an alternative, that one of the army from Troy might be the speaker of *vv.* 1625—1627. This however, making *five* speakers, not *four*, in the final scene, would not agree with the important evidence from Pollux, given in Appendix III.

delight in a dance (after *v.* 33), by way of prelude to the general rejoicings. Exit.

What here follows is not clearly indicated; but it can scarcely be supposed that the elders, who have still to be summoned (*v.* 270), enter at once. The text presumes some interval, and it is not likely that the action was arranged so as to contradict it. We may conjecture that the rousing of the palace, the sending out of the messengers, the kindling of fires upon the altar or altars before the entrance, and the rejoicing of the household, were typically represented in action with music, for which the words of the watchman (*φροίμιον χορεύσομαι*) seem to prepare the way. Enger, in his *Introduction*, makes, if I understand him rightly, some such suggestion (p. xviii). See also my edition of Euripides' *Ion*, Introduction pp. lix—lxxii, *On the Parodos*.

Enter the Elders (*Chorus I*), singing first a *march* (40—103) and then the *First Stasimon* or regular ode in responsion (104—268).

The great length of this ode is not an arbitrary or accidental circumstance. It calls attention to the delay of Clytaemnestra in appearing, which is a proper part of the plot[1].

The elders state the reason of their coming. They recall how the war was commenced with ambiguous omens, the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and the threatening prophecies thereupon. Doubtful as to the meaning of this nocturnal alarm, they have come, as invited by the queen, to assure themselves of the safety of the fortress.

First Scene in Dialogue (*vv.* 270—378). Clytaemnestra, with Conspirators (*Chorus II*), comes from the palace. She informs the elders that Troy has been taken during the night, and the news announced by a chain of beacons, of which she gives an imaginary description. By the assistance of her followers she eludes further enquiry, and retires.

From this time forward the elders are carefully watched, as the situation of the plot requires, by those in the queen's interest, who continue to assemble. The proceedings of the elders, and even their actual words, are reported within the palace. This, which in the theatre would be manifest of itself, is accidentally indicated to us by the text in the next scene, when Clytaemnestra makes a pointed allusion to the doubt which, during her absence, they have expressed as to the truth of her information. This deserves notice as an instructive example of the difficulties presented by a stage-play stripped of the necessary directions for action[2]. It is

[1] As to the apostrophe addressed to her at *v.* 83 see note there.

[2] I submit that the above is the only natural way of solving the question which the more careful commentators justly raise. "*καὶ τίς μ' ἐνίπτων* clearly refers to the incredulity of the chorus (485). How would K. know of this, it is asked, as she was not there? The answer is that the chorus only expresses the general feeling of the citizens, which she can naturally be supposed to learn". (Sidgwick on *v.* 595.) This answer seems to be an evasion. The question is not what other persons may have shared the feelings of the elders, but how did Clytaemnestra know what feelings the elders had expressed? It is to their expressed in-

scarcely necessary to point out, what opportunities are given in this scene and those that follow for effective contrasts of action between those who are in the secret and those who are not.

Second Stasimon (*vv.* 379—480). The elders, avoiding the topic of the alleged victory, pursue their reflexions upon the sin of Paris, and all the misery thereby caused to the princes and people of Argos, misery of which the end is yet obscure. The people are weary of their sufferings, and their anger, malignantly fomented, threatens the gravest danger; nor can the friends of the king appeal with a clear conscience to the favour of heaven. They fear an insurrection. Triumph and conquest they would gladly exchange for the security of their own freedom[1].

Their doubts still increasing, the elders in a brief *lyrical dialogue* are discussing not without contempt the alleged evidence for the victory, when they observe the approach of the herald and other signs of an arrival. Their hope that 'what is now happily believed may be happily increased', is echoed in a very different sense by those to whom it is addressed (*vv.* 481—507).

The dramatic effect of the situation here depends on the presence face to face of the elders and the objects of their suspicion.

Second Scene (*vv.* 508—685). The Herald, the Elders, Conspirators, and Clytaemnestra. The herald relates the destruction of Troy, the arrival of the king, and the storm.

The queen is summoned from the palace and comes hastily to put an end to the dangerous conversation which has commenced. The abruptness of her entrance and opening (*v.* 592) is accommodated to the situation. The favourable comment upon her speech (*vv.* 618—619) must be assigned to one of her party, as is shown by the reply from the other side. See note there.

Third Stasimon (*vv.* 686—773). The far-reaching consequences of crime are suggested by the fatal disaster just described. 'Again the application is apparently to Paris; again we feel that the sin of Agamemnon is present in the thought'.

March accompanying the Entrance of the King (*vv.* 774—800).

Here the effect of the scene depends entirely on the spectacular conditions. The king in his chariot, Cassandra, either with him or (according to the tradition) in a second chariot with spoils, and his following enter, accompanied by a crowd who seem to be giving them a triumphant welcome and expressing their sympathy

credulity that, as Mr Sidgwick says, she clearly refers.

[1] I have already noticed that the latter part of this ode is of the utmost importance as giving to us now some of the essential facts of the supposed situation.

(*v.* 781) with the sufferings which they have undergone. The elders, from their knowledge of the persons, cannot but suspect the honesty of the demonstration. It is this startling suspicion, as already noticed, which dictates the strange topics of their first address. At the close of the march, the scene is so arranged, we may presume, as to suggest a multitude entirely filling it and extending beyond it. This is one of the many passages of Athenian drama which might be cited against the view, formerly prevalent but now shaken by the archaeological discoveries of Dr Dörpfeld and others, that in the Greek theatre of the fifth century there was a high and narrow separate stage (λογεῖον) for the speakers as distinct from the rest of the company. For such a theatre such a scene as the text here suggests could scarcely have been composed. Compare the final scenes of the *Choephori* and the *Eumenides*.

Third Scene (*vv.* 801—965). Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra. The king enters the palace, commending Cassandra, who remains without, to a kind reception. Clytaemnestra follows.

See the preceding narrative. Here also the general action is important, particularly as to the effect of Agamemnon's haughty and threatening address, and of the invidious honours which he is compelled to accept. The device of the tapestry in particular, the purpose of which is intelligible only in its relation to the feelings of the crowd represented on the stage, would have occurred only to a dramatist who considered his whole company not less than his principal personages. When the king and queen have withdrawn into the palace with their immediate attendants, the crowd of returned soldiers, conspirators, and others would for the most part disperse, the king's companions still watched by their pretended friends. The general appearance of the action is easily imagined, though it would be useless to attempt exact description. During these proceedings is sung the

Fourth Stasimon (*vv.* 966—1018). The friends of the king, though unable to fix their suspicions, are more anxious than ever.

Fourth Scene. Clytaemnestra, the Elders, Cassandra. Clytaemnestra orders Cassandra, who remains still in the chariot, to come within and join the intended sacrifice. Cassandra, whose appearance is that 'of a wild beast new-taken', pays no attention, and the queen instantly withdraws.

In this brief incident the chief point is the violent impatience of the queen, who here and here only loses her dignity and presence of mind. In truth her act in summoning Cassandra at this critical minute is an imprudent concession to her appetite for revenge (see *v.* 1448). Note also that, being now sure of her triumph, she can scarcely refrain from a sneer at the victims of her deception (*vv.* 1040—1042).

Cassandra, by her prophetic power, in a series of visions sees the history of the Atridae, the crime of Atreus, and the murder of Agamemnon now imminent. Declaring his fate and her own to be inevitable, at last in despair she enters the palace.

"In this astonishing scene Aeschylus seems to have touched the limit of what speech can do to excite pity and terror. The cries come forth to Apollo, repeated louder and more wildly as the inspiration grows upon her; she smells the 'scent of murder on the walls' of the bloody house to which she comes as a prisoner, and visions rise, first of the past wickedness, then of the present; and lastly she bewails in songs of 'searching and melting beauty' her own piteous fate. The chorus sustain the part of the Argive citizen, sympathetic and horror-struck, and finally bewildered and overpowered by her clearer and clearer prophecies of the bloody deeds that are imminent". (Sidgwick.) Of the relation of this scene to the general effect of the play I have spoken already in the narrative. It should be observed however that here again the general action is essential to the comprehension of the spoken scene. Critics have objected (not unnaturally, if the play be read without reference to the action) to the helpless behaviour of the elders at the moment of the murder; and in fact long before this, as they are alarmed if not convinced (*v.* 1212) by Cassandra, their hesitation is only to be explained by a manifest impossibility of acting to any effect. But in truth they appear helpless because they are so and know it. From the previous incidents and the present situation of affairs it is plain that, if the king is truly in danger, then also they themselves are prisoners. They would not have been suffered either to enter the palace or to leave the fortress. It is not at all unnatural that old men in such a situation should be utterly paralysed, but it is by the action more than by the words that the situation is portrayed. (Prof. Tucker, in the *Classical Review* VI. 340, rejects the general assumption that the elders do show weakness. That they show also signs of spirit is true; but surely the very notion of a formal debate at such a moment is inconsistent with ability or intention to do anything.)

Fifth Scene (*vv.* 1342—1576). Clytaemnestra, the Elders, etc. The dying cry of Agamemnon is heard within, and while the elders are still pretending to consider the situation, the palace is thrown open and discloses Clytaemnestra standing over the bodies of her two victims.

From the language of the elders (*vv.* 1353—1356), it is evident that other signs, besides the king's cry, declare the triumph of the plot. In fact the stage, in Greek parlance the *orchestra*, rapidly fills again with the exultant crowd and the indignant few (see *vv.* 1400—1411). As to the remnant of fighting-men returned from Troy, we are manifestly to suppose them surprised and slain (as in Homer) at the moment of Agamemnon's murder. In an archaic Greek state a ship-load of veterans, if allowed fair play, would have been masters of the situation, and the tyrants dared not spare them, if they would. It is this which explains and justifies the prominence and pathos given to the character of the herald, whose part is in every way superior to that of the king. From his entrance to his exit (see *vv.* 508—512, 572—577, 655—657, 676—677) his language is ominous. And in truth he is actually near to death, and is thus a tragic character as much as the rest.

A curious question arises here as to the exact manner in which the king's death is represented. Modern readers infer from the text that the interior of the palace is not shown to the audience until Agamemnon and Cassandra are lying dead; and the inference seems natural though not necessary. On the other hand the Greek hypothesis says expressly that 'Aeschylus is peculiar in representing Agamemnon as

killed upon the stage, *ἰδίως δὲ Αἰσχύλος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναιρεῖσθαι ποιεῖ*: and as the text does not suggest this, it is one of the few points in the hypothesis which might appear to rest on some independent tradition. The truth is that our knowledge of ancient scenery is hardly such as to warrant positive assertion on details of this kind.

Clytaemnestra appears and fiercely justifies her act. She describes the manner of the king's death with cruel detail, answers invective with invective, and declares her reliance upon her partizans and upon the loyalty of Aegisthus. She even forces the lamenting elders to admit that as between her and her husband the justice of the case is doubtful (*v.* 1569). But a fresh explosion of feeling is produced by the entrance of Aegisthus himself, with his band (*λοχῖται* *v.* 1650).

The meeting of the triumphant lovers is left entirely to action, as is necessary. Conversation between them at such a moment and in such a presence would have been altogether out of place. From the fact that Aegisthus' speech is immediately preceded by a speech of Clytaemnestra it is clear that she does not leave the stage.

Finale. Aegisthus, Clytaemnestra, etc. Aegisthus claims to have merely procured his 'just restoration' to Argos (*v.* 1608), while avenging upon the son of Atreus the wrongs of his father and his own.

That Aegisthus does not come from the palace, but on the contrary has just entered the country, is shown not only by his address, but by the interval which occurs between the achievement of the murder and his appearance. Consistent in his 'prudent' plan, he does not enter the fortress till the deed is actually done and all is safe.

This is too much for the friends of the king. Stung by their taunts Aegisthus calls on his ruffians to commence a massacre, when the queen, with hypocritical clemency, interposes to prevent an impolitic cruelty which might yet have endangered the success. 'Less', she says, 'than blood-shed will serve the occasion' (*vv.* 1654—1664). Accordingly the elders are led away to imprisonment; and with this final triumph of Clytaemnestra the scene comes to an end.

4. *Critical Remarks.*

I hope I am not rash in thinking that the preceding exposition of the play does in its general outline fulfil the conditions; that is to say, the story is itself intelligible, and it explains why the drama is constructed as it is, and what are the relations of its parts to one another. As to the details I do not pretend to offer more than conjecture; on the

contrary I maintain that this is the utmost which, in details, the state of our information permits, and that by better use of the materials others may, and certainly will, improve upon the suggestions here made. The outline will, I believe, be accepted after time for reflexion as right; and I will even go so far as to say that the play would never in modern times of good literary judgment have been interpreted otherwise, if we had not allowed the imagination of the eleventh century, criticized and for the most part contemptuously rejected on other points, to rule us unquestioned upon this. It is not in the least surprising that the annotators of the Medicean MS. should have lost or corrupted the genuine tradition here as elsewhere, and that they should be wrong about the story, as they are wrong more often than not about the language and the meaning of the poet. Indeed if there is any department of criticism in which the scholars of that time are manifestly incompetent, it is the artistic part. We owe our whole knowledge of Aeschylus to their diligence; but we do not and must not obey them[1]. There is ancient authority, very far better than that of the existing MSS., for part at least, an important part, of the interpretation here put forward (see Appendix III.).

But indeed the question is not one of authority at all. On no authority, under the author himself, should it be believed, that any man conceived such a plot as the Byzantine editors attribute to Aeschylus: and if Aeschylus could say that such actually was his conception, we with the *Agamemnon* before us might well reply, that accident had singularly improved his design. As it is, the text of the play is the sole and sufficient authority for the poet's intention.

Nor is it ground for demur, that the Medicean hypothesis has continued to pass current during the two centuries at most (we might largely reduce the time) during which Aeschylus from a literary point of view has been efficiently studied in the West. Even the fifteenth

[1] In this matter, as in many others, the MS. commentary actually preserves traces of the truth, though not understood by those who copied them down. On the first line it is observed in the Medicean scholia that *θεράπων Ἀγαμέμνονος ὁ προλογιζόμενος, οὐχὶ ὁ ὑπὸ Αἰγίσθου ταχθείς*. The comparison, as is noted by Hermann and others, is between the Watchman in Aeschylus, and the Watchman in Homer (see pp. xxviii, xxxiii). Now according to the story of Aeschylus as told in the Medicean hypothesis, there is no resemblance whatever between the functions of these persons, and the comparison is pointless. But as a fact their functions are exactly analogous: in Aeschylus as in Homer the 'year-long watch' represents the duration of Aegisthus' plot, of which the Homeric watchman is a conscious instrument, the Aeschylean an unconscious.

century murmured[1]: and it would indeed have been strange, if the readers of Shakespeare and of succeeding dramatists had accepted such a plot with satisfaction. But they never have so accepted it. On the contrary they have transmitted it with manifest discontent, actually concealing its absurdity, so far as possible, by artifice. If we add that until times within living memory the exponents of Aeschylus were necessarily and properly engrossed by the preliminary difficulties of language and grammar (Paley's edition was actually the first exception in English), we shall not accuse our instructors of adding much authority to a tradition which they would have been only too glad to disbelieve.

In reality the plot of the *Agamemnon* is perfectly coherent and natural. In one detail it is judiciously improbable. When, by the announcement of the herald, the queen's interpretation of the beacon is disproved, the elders would have acted prudently if they had questioned him on the subject, and communicated their own suspicions: and we may therefore call it in a certain sense improbable that they should act otherwise. This 'improbability', as nothing would have been easier than to avoid it, the dramatist must be supposed to have sought. And he had good reason. It would have been a gross violation of the true and vital probabilities of the case, and a great loss to the dramatic interest, if he had represented the design of Aegisthus as never running near to failure. Only by the favour of circumstances, and of human blindness or weakness for one circumstance, could a design so audacious succeed at all: and Aeschylus has wisely chosen that this ingredient of necessary chance shall not be concealed but exhibited.

In one other matter the dramatist has disregarded, not indeed probability (very far from it), but a certain expectation, which we, accustomed to the modern conditions of the stage, might have formed from the course of the play. A modern playwright, having to tell all his story for himself, would have thought it desirable, by way of accenting the construction and rounding off the development, to introduce, after the triumph of the plot, a plain description of the artifice by which it was conducted, or at least an allusion to it, such as appears in the *Choephori*. The absence of any such allusion in the *Agamemnon* (for the passing glance of Clytaemnestra in *v.* 1436 is not sufficient to

[1] Schol. in *Cod. Flor.* to *v.* 509 τινὲς μέμφονται τῷ ποιητῇ ὅτι αὐθήμερον ἐκ Τροίας ποιεῖ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἥκοντας.

suggest anything of itself) facilitated the error of the mediaeval editors and has made it more difficult of detection. But manifestly, in the matter of truth and nature, Aeschylus is right. In the first outbreak of anger and defiance neither victors nor vanquished would fall to discussing or describing the device by which the contest was lost and won. The first address of Aegisthus to his Argive supporters and subjects turns naturally upon what he alleges for the rights of his cause: and it is only because he is too violent and vain-glorious to govern his tongue, that he touches at all upon the inopportune topic of his stratagem (*v.* 1609). Before a modern audience, who did not know the story, Aegisthus would necessarily have been made to narrate his plan and its success, although in real life he would not do so, simply lest some of the spectators should be left in the dark. Aeschylus, by the conditions of his art, was spared the necessity of this misrepresentation.

What points have been added to the story by the dramatist himself, we can scarcely guess and have little interest in knowing. But it is likely that those incidents, which would be effective on the stage only, were invented for the stage; and for this reason we may refer to this origin the whole apparatus of the king's entrance, including the laying of the tapestry, the whole vision of Cassandra, and perhaps also the *ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον*, in which at the last moment the victim is enfolded. This curious device is to the plot of the *Agamemnon* so unimportant, that if the play had survived alone, we might well have wondered why it is introduced. But the question is answered in the *Choephori*, where one of the best scenes is the exhibition of the garment by Orestes, after he has avenged the murder which it served to commit[1]. It is there used as Antony uses the robe of Caesar, and with similar dramatic effect. For the sake of this scene and of the closely connected reference in the *Eumenides* (*v.* 463), it is introduced and made prominent in the *Agamemnon*. It serves also, by its appearance in the sequel as evidence of the crime, to fix attention upon the part of Clytaemnestra, with whom only, and not with Aegisthus, the moral interest of the story is concerned. The stratagem of the beacon was, we may say, certainly not first introduced into the story by the tragedian. If it had been, it would not be presented as it is. Who was the inventor, it is useless to ask. Possibly some one not more deserving of remembrance than some of the romancers who supplied material to

[1] *Cho.* 971 foll.

Shakespeare. To the essential originality of the poet such questions are of course immaterial.

Indeed it would be a grave mistake to exaggerate the importance, in a literary aspect, of the whole subject which has been set forth, at great but I trust not unpardonable length, in this introduction. Undoubtedly the main purpose of the poet, or at any rate his chief value for us now, lies in things almost independent of his story, in the majesty and beauty of his language, in the bold delineation of character, and in the deep moral feeling with which the whole subject is coloured. To the temporary object of winning the prize, which we may guess that Aeschylus did not undervalue, the difference between an absurd and an effective plot would be vital: nor can it be thought indifferent to the mere reader, whether the beginning of the play has or has not any intelligible connexion with the middle and end of it. But I would not for my own sake leave the impression, that I have proportioned the topics to my estimate of their permanent significance. The story of the *Agamemnon*, once understood, might with justice to Aeschylus be stated and dismissed in a brief summary. The critical discussion of it is required only by the present state of the subject. It is however required now; and for this reason only I hope to be excused, if I seem unduly to neglect other matters of not less moment, upon which I have nothing to say which has not been excellently said before.

I would draw attention to an adverse criticism upon my view of the plot by Prof. Lewis Campbell (*Classical Review* IV. 303), and would refer the reader also to further remarks of my own in the Introduction to my edition of Euripides' *Ion*, 'The Unity of Time'.

5. *The Text.*

The text of the *Agamemnon* depends mainly upon two MSS. The *Mediceus* (M) should be regarded as the sole authority for those parts which it contains (*vv.* 1—322 and *vv.* 1051—1158). Only one MS. of any value, the *Florentinus* (f), contains the whole play, and for nearly one half of it (*vv.* 361—1050) this is necessarily the sole authority. One other MS., the *Farnesianus* (h), contains the whole play, but it is worthless. Its very numerous variations are, in the great majority of cases, manifestly conjectures upon a text derived from M. Before therefore any weight can be assigned to its variation in a particular place, it must appear that the reading cannot be merely conjectural,

that is, it must be such as the corrector could not have propounded for sense—a condition not easy to be fulfilled. All critics put the MS. very low, but the only logical course is to ignore it altogether. I have cited it only so far as seemed sufficient to show its character.

Two of the imperfect MSS., *Marcianus Bessarionis* (a) and *Venetus* (g), include parts of the play not in M, the first a few lines (*vv.* 323—360), the second a large piece (*v.* 1159—the end), but neither gives much assistance which cannot be had from the *Florentinus*. The MSS. are cited as in the apparatus of Wecklein (ed. 1885), to whom I would repeat the acknowledgments made in my edition of the *Septem*.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΟΝΟΣ ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ[1].

Ἀγαμέμνων εἰς Ἴλιον ἀπιὼν τῇ Κλυταιμήστρᾳ, εἰ πορθήσοι τὸ Ἴλιον, ὑπέσχετο τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας σημαίνειν διὰ τοῦ πυρσοῦ. ὅθεν σκοπὸν ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ μισθῷ Κλυταιμήστρα, ἵνα τηροίη τὸν πυρσόν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἰδὼν ἀπήγγειλεν, αὐτὴ δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλον μεταπέμπεται, περὶ τοῦ πυρσοῦ ἐροῦσα· ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ χορὸς συνίσταται· οἵτινες ἀκούσαντες παιανίζουσιν. μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ Ταλθύβιος παραγίνεται καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν διηγεῖται. Ἀγαμέμνων δ' ἐπὶ ἀπήνης ἔρχεται· εἵπετο δ' αὐτῷ ἑτέρα ἀπήνη, ἔνθα ἦν τὰ λάφυρα καὶ ἡ Κασάνδρα. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν προεισέρχεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον σὺν τῇ Κλυταιμήστρᾳ, Κασάνδρα δὲ προμαντεύεται, πρὶν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια εἰσελθεῖν, τὸν ἑαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐξ Ὀρέστου μητροκτονίαν, καὶ εἰσπηδᾷ ὡς θανουμένη, ῥίψασα τὰ στέμματα. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μέρος τοῦ δράματος θαυμάζεται ὡς ἔκπληξιν ἔχον καὶ οἶκτον ἱκανόν. ἰδίως δὲ Αἰσχύλος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναιρεῖσθαι ποιεῖ, τὸν δὲ Κασάνδρας σιωπήσας θάνατον νεκρὰν αὐτὴν ὑπέδειξεν, πεποίηκέν τε Αἴγισθον καὶ Κλυταιμήστραν ἑκάτερον διισχυριζόμενον περὶ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως ἑνὶ κεφαλαίῳ, τὴν μὲν τῇ ἀναιρέσει Ἰφιγενείας, τὸν δὲ ταῖς τοῦ πατρὸς Θυέστου ἐξ Ἀτρέως συμφοραῖς.

ἐδιδάχθη τὸ δρᾶμα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Φιλοκλέους ὀλυμπιάδι ὀγδοηκοστῇ ἔτει δευτέρῳ (B.C. 458). πρῶτος Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι, Χοηφόροις, Εὐμενίσι, Πρωτεῖ σατυρικῷ. ἐχορήγει Ξενοκλῆς Ἀφιδνεύς.

[1] See the Preface and Introduction.

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ[1].

ΦΥΛΑΞ.

ΧΟΡΟΣ.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ.

ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤΡΑ.

ΤΑΛΘΥΒΙΟΣ ΚΗΡΥΞ.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ΚΑΣΑΝΔΡΑ.

ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ.

[1] For the *dramatis personae* see Appendix III.

ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ΦΥΛΑΞ.

Θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων
φρουρᾶς ἐτείας μῆκος, ἣν κοιμώμενος
στέγαις Ἀτρειδῶν ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην,
ἄστρων κάτοιδα νυκτέρων ὁμήγυριν
καὶ τοὺς φέροντας χεῖμα καὶ θέρος βροτοῖς,
λαμπροὺς δυνάστας ἐμπρέποντας αἰθέρι,
ἀστέρας, ὅταν φθίνωσιν, ἀντολάς τε τῶν·
καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τὸ σύμβολον,
αὐγὴν πυρὸς φέρουσαν ἐκ Τροίας φάτιν
ἁλώσιμόν τε βάξιν·—ὧδε γὰρ κρατεῖ
γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ·
εὖτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλαγκτον ἔνδροσόν τ' ἔχω
εὐνὴν ὀνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπουμένην

1—322. Readings of M. 2. δ' ἣν.

---

1. **μὲν...καὶ νῦν** (8)...**νῦν δέ** (20) 'I have long been praying for release, and still am watching, but this time I hope to be answered'.

2. **κοιμώμενος στέγαις...ἄγκαθεν.** See Appendix A.

4—7. **ἄστρων...ὁμήγυριν καὶ τοὺς φέροντας...ἀστέρας.** *ἀστήρ* as opposed to *ἄστρον* is properly *a great star*, and here stands for the great and familiar stars which mark the seasons. (This is substantially Hermann's view.) For **καὶ** cf. *Pers.* 751 *θεῶν δὲ πάντων ᾤετ' οὐκ εὐβουλίᾳ καὶ Ποσειδῶνος κρατήσειν* (Housman *J. Phil.* XVI. 246.—To those (Valckenaer) who condemn *v.* 7 as spurious, it is replied that *τῶν* is not the style of an interpolator (Housman). There is no evidence against the verse except the rarity of the initial dactyl, but it must

wraits for signal to reveal fall of Troy.

TRANSLATION.

(*For the scenery and action see the Introduction.*)

A Watchman. A whole long year of watch have I prayed heaven for release, a year that, like a dog, I have made my bed in the embrace of this palace-roof, till I know all the nightly company of the stars, and chiefly those chief signs that, marked by their brightness for the princes of the sky, bring summer and winter to man, all their wanings and the risings thereof. And still I am watching for the token-flame, the beacon-blaze which is to carry the news from Troy, the tidings of the capture! This it is to be commanded by a woman, who brings her quick hopes into the business of men! When I have found my bed, rain-wetted, restless, and safer than some are from the visit of

---

be marked as doubtful.—ἀντολάς τ' ἐτῶν Keck, where ἔτη would be the annual returns of the constellations to their positions for a certain season. This should be considered in connexion with *inf.* 509 and the Introduction.

10. **ἁλώσιμον**: news *of* the capture: cf. *Theb.* 622 ἁλώσιμον παιᾶνα 'a cheer *for* the capture' (Wecklein).—**ὧδε κρατεῖ** *this it is to be commanded by*, literally 'thus uses power'; see *v.* 942 τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλθακῶς.

11. **γυναικὸς...κέαρ** 'one who meddles in the business of man with the sanguine feelings of a woman': cf. *Theb.* 182 μέλει γὰρ ἀνδρί, μὴ γυνὴ βουλευέτω τἄξωθεν.—**γυναικὸς** is generic (not 'the lady' *i.e.* Clytaemnestra), and ἐλπίζον κέαρ a generic description of woman.—ἐλπίζον, wider than *hope*, includes fancy, imagination, etc. So ἐλπίζω often means *to imagine.*—Note that ἐλπίζον is a constant epithet, ἀνδρόβουλον (=ἀνδρόβουλον ὄν) particular to the occasion, a common use of double epithets in Aeschylus.—The speaker is disposed to regard his strange occupation as due to some wild freak of the queen's capricious fancy and feminine imagination; hence the sarcastic allusion, which follows, to her 'dreams'. A similar thought occurs to the elders (*v.* 286); and see Clytaemnestra's pretended description of herself as dreaming anxious dreams about Agamemnon (*v.* 882).

12—19 is one period, the construction being εὖτ' ἂν...ἔχω, ὅταν...δοκῶ, κλαίω τότε. In *v.* 16 **δέ**, like δ' οὖν, marks merely resumption after the parenthesis.

13. **εὐνὴν...ἐμὴν** 'the couch where no dream visits *me*'. **ἐμὴν**, emphatic in itself, is here emphasized strongly by position

ἐμήν (φόβος γὰρ ἀνθ' ὕπνου παραστατεῖ
τὸ μὴ βεβαίως βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὕπνῳ),
ὅταν δ' ἀείδειν ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ,
ὕπνου τόδ' ἀντίμολπον ἐντέμνων ἄκος,
κλαίω τότ' οἴκου τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων,
οὐχ ὡς τὰ πρόσθ' ἄριστα διαπονουμένου·—
νῦν δ' εὐτυχὴς γένοιτ' ἀπαλλαγὴ πόνων
εὐαγγέλου φανέντος ὀρφναίου πυρός.
ὦ χαῖρε λαμπτήρ, νυκτὸς ἡμερήσιον
φάος πιφαύσκων καὶ χορῶν κατάστασιν
πολλῶν ἐν Ἄργει, τῆσδε συμφορᾶς χάριν,
ἰοὺ ἰού.
Ἀγαμέμνονος γυναικὶ σημαίνω τορῶς,
εὐνῆς ἐπαντείλασαν ὡς τάχος δόμοις
ὀλολυγμὸν εὐφημοῦντα τῇδε λαμπάδι
ἐπορθριάζειν, εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλις
ἑάλωκεν, ὡς ὁ φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλλων πρέπει·
αὐτός τ' ἔγωγε φροίμιον χορεύσομαι.

30. ἀγγέλων.

---

in the sentence and verse, importing a contrast between the speaker and some one else, whom dreams *do* visit. The context points the allusion. The dreams of the mistress condemn the poor servant to a couch, where dreams would be only too welcome!—ἐμήν is commonly treated as inexplicable and corrupt, but, as I think, without reason.

14—15. *For, instead of sleep, I am haunted by the fear, that by sleep I might close my eyes for ever*, that is, 'might suffer death, if I missed the signal or were caught neglecting my watch', the queen like Creon in the *Antigone* (οὐχ ὑμὶν Ἅιδης μοῦνος ἀρκέσει 308) having, we may presume, threatened this penalty.—For the popular euphemism 'lasting sleep' for 'death' see *v.* 1450 τὸν αἰεὶ ὕπνον, *v.* 1293 ὄμμα συμβαλῶ τόδε.—**βεβαίως** lit. *permanently*, *lastingly*, as in πλοῦτος ἄδικος οὐ βέβαιος etc. The use of the softer word instead of the more explicit ἐς ἀεί adds to the euphemism a touch of rough humour.—**τὸ μὴ κτλ.** This, meaning literally 'the (thought of) not closing my eyes in sleep permanently', explains the substantive **φόβος**. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 184 φόβος (ἐστὶν) εἰ πείσω, and for the form of the clause Plato *Laws* 943 D χρὴ πᾶσαν ἐπιφέροντα δίκην ἀνδρὶ πάντ' ἄνδρα φοβεῖσθαι τὸ μὴ ἐπενεγκεῖν ψευδῆ τιμωρίαν, 'in inflicting punishment a man should always have before him the fear of inflicting a wrong penalty'. (See *contra* L. Campbell *Class. Rev.* IV. 301, whose objection I have endeavoured to meet.)—The repetition **ἀνθ' ὕπνου**...

dreams (for instead of sleep comes the fear that sleeping might close my eyes for ever), and when the fancy comes to whistle or sing by way of a salve for drowsiness, then tears arise of sorrow for what hath befallen this house, now put to no such good work as in the old days. But ah, this time may the blessed release be given, the blessed beacon appear with its message from the dark.

O joy! O welcome blaze, that showest in night as it were a dawn, thou harbinger of many a dance, that shall be set in Argos for this good hap! What ho! Lady of Agamemnon, I cry you loud. Up from the dark couch, quick, up, and raise the morning-hymn of thine house in honour of yon fire, if, as the signal doth manifestly announce, Troy town is taken indeed. Aye, and myself at least will prelude the dancing; for my score

---

ὕπνῳ is proper, if not necessary, to the point.—The common interpretation is this: 'for I have with me fear instead of sleep, so that I cannot go to sleep soundly'. But a great number of emendations show the just objections made to this. *τὸ...ὕπνῳ* is then superfluous, and the repetition *ὕπνου...ὕπνῳ* pointless.

17. 'Thus making of song one remedy against sleep', using song among (*ἐν*) other things to keep myself awake. *τέμνειν* was the technical term for shredding the roots, herbs etc. compounded in drugs (Blomfield, and see L. and Sc. *s.v.*).

19. ...*Put to work not so good altogether as in old times.* The passive *πονεῖσθαι* (*πόνον*) signifies *to be worked at*, *πόνος* being technical for any exercise or task-work. So the deponent *διαπονεῖσθαι* is the regular word for a professional practice.—There is a double meaning in this cautious phrase, depending on the ambiguity of *οἶκος* between *household* and *house*. Under the mere grumble of the servant lies the same suggestion as in *v.* 37.—The rendering 'managed, administered' (L. and Sc. *s.v. διαπονεῖσθαι*) is incorrect.

21. **ὀρφναίου πυρός** 'fire of the darkness', *i.e.* which the darkness keeps and will not disclose.

25. He calls as to awaken the slumbering house. Hence **σημαίνω** in *v.* 26. —*σημανῶ* recc.

27. **δόμοις** 'for the house', *i.e.* on behalf of the household.

28. **λαμπάδι**, dependent on *ἐπ-ορθριάζειν*, 'upon' *i.e.* 'in honour of' its appearance.

29. **ἐπορθριάζειν** 'to sing as a morning song' (*ὄρθριος*), pursuing the train of metaphor suggested by *ἡμερήσιον φάος*, *ἐπαντείλασαν* etc.—*ἐπορθιάζειν* recc. I cannot but think the modern editors wrong in generally adopting this change, probably a mere error. The associations of *ὄρθιος*, *shrill*, *high*, and of the *ὄρθιος νόμος*, are as foreign to the passage as *ὄρθριος* is appropriate.

30. **ὁ** '*the* (expected) beacon': cf. *τὸ σύμβολον* in *v.* 8.

32. **τὰ-δεσποτῶν-εὖ-πεσόντα θήσομαι** 'my lord's good fortune I shall score to my game', *i.e.* regard it as my own: *οἰκειώσομαι* schol. So *vice versa χρηστοῖσι δούλοις συμφορὰ τὰ δεσποτῶν κακῶς πίτνοντα* (Eur. *Med.* 54), apparently an imitation. Cf. *στέργειν δὲ τἀκπεσόντα καὶ θέσθαι* (accept and score) *πρέπει* (Soph. *fr.* 686), and Horace 'quod fors dierum cumque dabit, lucro *appone*'. So also

τὰ δεσποτῶν γὰρ εὖ πεσόντα θήσομαι
τρὶς ἓξ βαλούσης τῆσδέ μοι φρυκτωρίας.

γένοιτο δ' οὖν μολόντος εὐφιλῆ χέρα
ἄνακτος οἴκων τῇδε βαστάσαι χερί.
τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ μέγας
βέβηκεν· οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι,
σαφέστατ' ἂν λέξειεν· ὡς ἑκὼν ἐγὼ
μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι.

ΧΟΡΟΣ.

Δέκατον μὲν ἔτος τόδ' ἐπεὶ Πριάμῳ
μέγας ἀντίδικος,
Μενέλαος ἄναξ ἠδ' Ἀγαμέμνων,
διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δισκήπτρου
τιμῆς ὀχυρὸν ζεῦγος Ἀτρείδαιν,
στόλον Ἀργείων χιλιοναύτην
τῆσδ' ἀπὸ χώρας
ἦραν, στρατιῶτιν ἀρωγήν—
μέγαν ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες Ἄρη,
τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν, οἵτ' ἐκπατίοις
ἄλγεσι παίδων, ὕπατοι λεχέων,
στροφοδινοῦνται,
πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι,
δεμνιοτήρη
πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες·
ὕπατος δ' αἴων ἤ τις Ἀπόλλων

44. Ἀτρειδᾶν.

Wecklein. Perhaps we should read *ἐμοὶ* (Keck) in *v.* 33.—Others take *εὖ πεσόντα* as predicate, 'I shall reckon fortunate'; but on such a question the Greek tradition seems entitled to respect.

33. **τρὶς ἕξ**: the best possible throw with *three* cubical dice.—Here the slave begins to dance, but presently remembering the many anxieties which in any case still remain, pauses and resumes (*δ' οὖν*) his gloomy meditation.—For a proposed re-arrangement, placing *vv.* 36—39 after *v.* 19 (Herwerden, Earle) see *Class. Rev.* XVII. 102. It is certainly smoother, but less dramatic.

36. **βοῦς...βέβηκεν** 'I have weighty

shall profit by my master's game, the treble-six, thrown me by yon fire-signal.

Well, may the king return, may I clasp his welcome hand in mine. The rest shall be unspoken (my tongue hath upon it an ox-foot weight), though the house itself, if it could find a voice, might declare it plain enough; for I mean to be, for my part, clear to who knows and to him who knows not—blind. [*Exit.*]

Chorus of Elders. 'Tis now the tenth year since, to urge their powerful right against Priam, King Menelaus and King Agamemnon, the mighty sons of Atreus, paired in the honour of throne and sceptre derived from Zeus, put forth from this land with an Argive armament, a thousand crews of fighting men, summoned to their aid.

Loud rang their angry battle-cry, as the scream of vultures who, vexed by boys in the supreme solitudes where they nest, wheel with beating pinions round and round, when they miss the young brood whose bed it was their care to watch. And the shrill sad cry of the birds is heard by ears supreme, by

---

reasons for silence', *i.e.* the fear of punishment and of losing, if overheard, the reward of his service. This is the general meaning: *παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ δυναμένων παρρησιάζεσθαι*, Hesychius. So also *βοῦς μοι ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ κρατερῷ ποδὶ λὰξ ἐπιβαίνων ἴσχει κωτίλλειν καίπερ ἐπιστάμενον* Theogn. 850.—The origin of a proverb is an uncertain speculation. Of many conjectures, the latest (Wecklein), that it is an allusion to the *ἱμὰς βόειος*, or ox-leather scourge, with which slaves were punished, seems as probable as any.

37. He glances at the queen's adultery.

39. *It is my intention to have meaning for those* (only) *who understand, while those who do not may think that I do not see*, literally 'I am (willingly) unobservant for those who do not understand'. *λήθομαι* is here the passive answering to the active *λανθάνει με τοῦτο* 'I do not observe this'.—On the interval here see the Introduction.

40. **Πριάμῳ**: the dative depends primarily on *ἀντίδικος* (cf. *ἀντίτυπος, ἀντίπαλος* etc.) and more generally, as dative of interest, on the whole following sentence.—*Πριάμου* recc.—The singular *ἀντίδικος* includes both brothers as one 'party' to the suit, Menelaus having precedence, as the wrong was strictly his (Sidgwick).

44. **'Ατρείδαιν** Dindorf.

45. **χιλιοναύτην** *of a thousand crews.*

49—51. See Appendix B.

54. **πόνον ὀρταλίχων**: gen. of equivalent, 'the brood, their care'.

55. **ὕπατος** echoes *ὕπατοι* in *v.* 50 and leads up to the figure *μετοίκων*. The birds are 'licensed dwellers' in the high abodes of the gods.—*Apollo* as god of augury, *Pan* of animal life, *Zeus* of universal right. (Schneidewin.)—The appearance of the humble Pan in the com-

ἢ Πὰν ἢ Ζεὺς οἰωνόθροον
γόον ὀξυβόαν
τῶνδε μετοίκων ὑστερόποινον
πέμπει παραβᾶσιν Ἐρινύν.
οὕτω δ' Ἀτρέως παῖδας ὁ κρείσσων
ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πέμπει ξένιος
Ζεύς, πολυάνορος ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς
πολλὰ παλαίσματα καὶ γυιοβαρῆ,
γόνατος κονίαισιν ἐρειδομένου
διακναιομένης τ' ἐν προτελείοις
κάμακος, θήσων Δαναοῖσιν
Τρωσί θ' ὁμοίως·—ἔστι δ' ὅπῃ νῦν
ἔστι· τελεῖται δ' ἐς τὸ πεπρωμένον·
οὔθ' ὑποκαίων οὔθ' ὑπολείβων,
οὔτε δακρύων, ἀπύρων ἱερῶν
ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.

69. ὑποκλαίων.

---

pany of these great Olympians is a characteristic of the time. See on *Theb.* 132.

56. **οἰωνόθροον...ὀξυβόαν**: see on *v.* 11.

58. **τῶνδε μετοίκων** (ὄντων) 'of them, because they are their *μέτοικοι*', and entitled to their protection: "dieser, die ihre *μέτοικοι* sind, wie Soph. *El.* 790 *πρὸς τῆσδ' ὑβρίζῃ μητρός* (von dieser, die deine Mutter sein will)" Wecklein.—The difficulty raised by Hermann against *τῶνδε* arises from not observing the predicative force of *μετοίκων*.—**ὑστερόποινον** 'punishing in after time' *i.e.* 'soon or late', in the end, though the vengeance *may* be deferred. Perhaps it was a popular belief that such youthful cruelties (note *παίδων*) were especially liable to be avenged in kind, by refusing children to the offenders or taking their children away. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1074 *τούτων σε λωβητῆρες ὑστεροφθόροι λοχῶσιν Ἅιδου καὶ θεῶν Ἐρινύες, ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς τοῖσδε ληφθῆναι κακοῖς.*

60. **ὁ κρείσσων......ξένιος Ζεύς** *their mightier Zeus, the guardian of hospitality* (*ὁ κρείσσων* referring back to the *Zeus* of the birds, *v.* 56), mightier as representing a stronger claim, since the faith of the *ξένος*, outraged by Paris, was the very strongest of obligations from a religious point of view.

61. **Ἀλεξάνδρῳ** the triumphant Paris. On the name *Ἀλέξανδρος* see on *vv.* 708, 714.

62. **πολυάνορος** *won* (not *wooed*) *by many*, a woman that could not be faithful to one. For the contemptuous force of the epithet here cf. *vv.* 790 foll.

65. **προτελείοις** properly *ritual preceding marriage*, used here with irony, the war being the *προτέλεια* through which Helen must be finally won.—As this comparison is clearly the point of the sentence, it is probably pursued in

Apollo belike or Pan or Zeus, who to avenge the licensed sojourners of their dwelling-place, sends soon or late on the offenders the ministers of punishment. Even such ministers are the sons of Atreus, sent to punish the triumph of Paris by their mightier Zeus, guardian of hospitality, that so for a woman whom many could win there should be wrestlings many and weary, where the knee is pressed in the dust and the shaft is snapped, between suffering Greek and Trojan suffering too.

The cause is this day no further: the end will be as it must. By no increase of fuel or libation, and by no tears, shalt thou overcome the stubbornness of a sacrifice that will not burn.

---

detail. The 'breaking of the rod', for example, may well have been a marriage-custom, having the common motive of averting the evil eye. To this motive is assigned a somewhat similar Indian custom, to which I am referred by Dr J. G. Frazer: "on déchire une toile en deux devant les yeux des deux mariés, et on en jette les morceaux des deux côtés opposés". Sonnerat, *Voyage aux Indes et à la Chine*, I. p. 78.—I have cancelled the reference here (ed. 1) to Raphael's *Sposalizio*. Several critics have pointed out that, since the 'breaking of the rods' is explained in that case by a special legend, it does not prove a custom.

67. **δέ** refers to *μέν* in *v.* 40. 'In all this time we see no accomplishment (*the matter stands as it doth*) though it will end as it must'.

69—71. **παραθέλξει**, 2nd pers. sing. fut. mid., the 2nd person being used, as often in English and in Greek, for the indefinite. The schol. *λείπει τὸ τίς*, though bad in grammar, is right as to the meaning. The sentiment is general, and expands, in the form of a metaphor probably proverbial, the preceding words *τελεῖται ἐς τὸ πεπρωμένον*. Without metaphor the meaning is "if fate is against you, you may struggle in vain". To which party in the present contest this doctrine applies, whether the sin of Paris or the sin of Agamemnon will most affect the event, the speakers do not determine.—**ὑποκαίων** Casaubon. *ὑπο-* expresses that the fire or fuel is put, and the oil poured in, *under* the sacrifice to be burnt.—**ὀργάς**: not precisely 'anger' but *mood*, almost *caprice*, as in Eur. *Med.* 121 *χαλεπῶς ὀργὰς μεταβάλλουσιν*, and frequently.—As to the form *παραθέλξομαι*, the middle has its regular quasi-reflexive force ('in commodum facientis') as in *παράγομαι*, *παρίσταμαι*, *παρηγορέομαι*, and other verbs of like meaning. Of this particular form *θέλξομαι* no other example is noted; but there is nothing to raise difficulty in this, as it will scarcely be supposed that our list of such futures is or could possibly become complete. The quasi-reflexive middle forms are always rare, from the nature of the case; thus of *ῥήγνυμι*, a far commoner verb than *θέλγω*, the examples in this mood and meaning are extremely few.—All the commentators assume *παραθέλξει* here to be 3rd pers. active; but the difficulties thus arising are acknowledged by all, and appear to me insuperable. There is no subject to the verb, and the context supplies none, 'Paris' and 'Agamemnon', which are proposed, being both too remote. If the sentence is general, we are released from the task of finding any particular allusion in *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*.—Mr L. R. Farnell (*Class. Rev.* XI. 293) contends that the only possible meaning of **ἄπυρα ἱερά** *fireless sacrifice* is 'sacri-

ἡμεῖς δ' ἀτῖται σαρκὶ παλαιᾷ
τῆς τότ' ἀρωγῆς ὑπολειφθέντες
μίμνομεν ἰσχὺν
ἰσόπαιδα νέμοντες ἐπὶ σκήπτροις.
ὅ τε γὰρ νεαρὸς μυελὸς στέρνων
ἐντὸς ἀνᾴσσων
ἰσόπρεσβυς (Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ),
τί θ' ὑπεργήρως; φυλλάδος ἤδη
κατακαρφομένης τρίποδας μὲν ὁδοὺς
στείχει, παιδὸς δ' οὐδὲν ἀρείων
ὄναρ ἡμερόφατον ἀλαίνει.
σὺ δέ, Τυνδάρεω
θύγατερ, βασίλεια Κλυταιμήστρα,
τί χρέος; τί νέον; τί δ' ἐπαισθομένη,
τίνος ἀγγελίας
πειθοῖ περίπεμπτα θύος κινεῖς;
πάντων δὲ θεῶν τῶν ἀστυνόμων,

72. ἀτῖται. 77. ἀνάσσων. 79. τίθιπεργήρωσ.
87. θυοσκινεῖσ (the first ι in an erasure).

---

fice *offered* without fire', such as a libation, presentation of fruits or the like, citing θυσίαν ἄπυρον (Eur. *fr.* 904), ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς (Pind. *Ol.* 7. 89—90). This, if true, would disprove all proposed interpretations of this passage, and show it to be, as Mr Farnell infers, deeply corrupt. But the context seems to explain sufficiently the sense, doubtless exceptional, which is generally here assumed.—See also Prof. Robinson Ellis *Class. Rev.* III. 132.

72. **ἀτῖται** (ὄντες) if correct, is from ἀτίτης, 'one who does not pay, a defaulter'; *because with our outworn thews we made default, i.e.* could not render our due service any more (Weil, H. L. Ahrens). But perhaps it should be read as dat. fem. sing. from ἄτιτος *disregarded, unvalued*, and corrected to **ἀτίτῃ** (Wecklein, comparing, for the feminine termination, *Cho.* 617 ἀθανάτας, *Pers.* 599 περικλύστα etc.). Then the dative ἀτ. σαρκὶ παλ. is causal. It is not easy to choose.—σάρξ *muscle*, as in *Theb.* 609 γέροντα τὸν νοῦν σάρκα δ' ἡβῶσαν.

75. **ἰσόπαιδα** '*equal to* that of a child'. The compounds of ἰσο- preserve in the classical writers almost always the true sense of the word and are applied only to that which, like *force*, can be measured. The use for mere resemblance (as in ἰσόπετρος etc.) becomes common only in late Greek.

76—79. **τε...τε** *as...so*.

77. **ἀνᾴσσων** Hermann. The word suggests the pushing and shooting of young growth or sap (compare ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνει ἶσος), and answers to φυλλάδος κατακαρφομένης.

78. **Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ**: this qualifies the parallel, to the disadvantage of the old; note **δέ**. 'The spirit of war' not being 'in the fort', children do not miss the strength they have not known.

As for us, whose worn thews could not render their service, that martial gathering left us behind, and here we bide, on guiding-staves supporting our childish strength. For if the young breast, where the sap is but rising, is no better than eld but in this, that the spirit of war is not there, oh what is man, when he is more than old? His leaf is withered, and with his three feet he wanders, weak as a child, a day-lit dream.

But what of thee, daughter of Tyndareus, Queen Clytaemnestra? What calls? What news? On what intelligence, what convincing report, are thy messengers gone round bidding sacrifice? To all the gods that dwell in Argos, upper and

---

79. **τί θ' ὑπεργήρως;** Enger. The rhetorical question is much more favoured in Greek than in English. For *τί* anticipating a verb (*στείχει*) see *v.* 926.—**ὑπεργήρως** is properly a predicate (*ὑπεργήρως ὤν*) *what of it* (or *him*) *in sheer old age?*—*τὸ θ' ὑπεργήρων* Cod. Farn.

80. **μὲν...δέ**: as if 'three feet' should have meant greater power.—**τρίποδας** *i.e. ἐπὶ σκήπτροις.*

81. **ἀρείων** echoes to *Ἄρης* in *v.* 78: Aeschylus probably connected the words in fancy.

82. **ὄναρ ἡμερόφατον** *a dream in daylight.* There seems to be no reason for rejecting *ἡμερόφατος*. It is sufficiently certified by the existence of *φάω to light*, and is in form parallel to *ἄκρατος*. There are two forms of the stem, *φᾰ* and *φᾱ*, as in *φᾰνερός, φᾱνός*: the preference of the long vowel in *-φατος lit* is natural, *-φᾰτος* having two other meanings, *said* and *slain.*—*ἡμερόφαντον* Farn. *ἡμερόφοιτον* Ahrens.

83. The speaker "apostrophizes Clytaemestra, who remains within the house, as Ajax, lingering in his tent, is apostrophized in Soph. *Ai.* 134" (Wecklein). The form of apostrophe in both cases indicates the like impatience for the presence of the person addressed. It must not be supposed that Clytaemnestra appears.—It is not without significance that the name of the queen is thus introduced together with that of her father. To be a daughter of this house was no good omen, and the speaker glances, as it were involuntarily, at the reproach put more plainly in *v.* 905.—Clytae*m*estra (*sic*) Aeschylus *passim.*

87. **πειθοῖ**: literally 'from conviction of what report?' *i.e. by what report convinced?*—**περίπεμπτα** adverbial accusative, literally 'by the way of sending round'. The directions for sacrifice were sent not only to public places but generally throughout the country. See *v.* 599. From *v.* 96, we see that what was 'sent round' on such an occasion was not merely the message or order to sacrifice but materials from the sender, the prince or master, to aid the offering. Hence the point of noticing that the 'high flames' are 'persuaded' to rise by the rich oil or incense from the palace. It is a species of religious communion between the prince and the subject. The word *περίπεμπτα* was probably technical. It may be noted that the usage gave the queen in this instance an excellent opportunity for communicating unsuspected with her partizans.—**θύος κινεῖς** literally, 'start' sacrifice, 'set it going'. I prefer this reading (Prien) to *θυοσκεῖς* (Auratus, Turnebus, and the majority), both as adhering to the MS., and as more appropriate to the facts (see *v.* 599). The sacrifices are not exactly those of the queen, but of her commanding.

88. **τῶν ἀστυνόμων.** The 'gods of the city' generally.

ὑπάτων, χθονίων,
τῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἀγοραίων,
βωμοὶ δώροισι φλέγονται·
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλοθεν οὐρανομήκης
λαμπὰς ἀνίσχει,
φαρμασσομένη χρίματος ἁγνοῦ
μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις,
πελάνῳ μυχόθεν βασιλείῳ.
τούτων λέξασ' ὅ τι καὶ δυνατὸν
καὶ θέμις αἰνεῖν
παιών τε γενοῦ τῆσδε μερίμνης,
ἣ νῦν τοτὲ μὲν κακόφρων τελέθει,
τοτὲ δ' ἐκ θυσιῶν †ἀγανὰ φαίνεις
ἐλπὶς ἀμύνει φροντίδ' ἄπλειστον,
τὴν θυμοφθόρον λύπης φρένα.†
κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν—ὅδιον κράτος στρ. α΄.
αἴσιον ἀνδρῶν

---

90. **τῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἀγοραίων**: a strange antithesis, apparently without parallel, as is also *οἱ ἀγοραῖοι* as a name for a class of gods. *Οὐράνιος* in Greek theology is an epithet of dignity, applying generally to the great Olympian deities. As applied to a single deity it signifies that the deity is viewed in a high religious conception. Thus *Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία* is the patroness of chaste love, the great natural Right which sanctions filial love is *ἁ οὐρανία Θέμις* (Soph. *El.* 1064), and the object of Hippolytus' mystic and ascetic devotion is *ἁ Διὸς οὐρανία Ἄρτεμις* (Eur. *Hipp.* 59). Thus also in Eur. *El.* 1235 *θεοὶ οἱ οὐράνιοι* is contrasted with *δαίμονές τινες*, a lower term. There were everywhere vast numbers of 'deities', many of them much more popular than the exalted persons of the Olympian religion, who could not possibly have been termed *οὐράνιοι*, some of them mere idols, or something less. The so-called 'Hermae' of Athens are an instance. Since then *ἀγοραῖοι* is here opposed to *οὐράνιοι*, we must seek in it a meaning antithetic to *sublime, high-exalted*. I would suggest that *ἀγοραῖος*, in this theological use, has not the local sense, but the secondary sense of *popular* or *familiar*, somewhat as in *ἀγοραῖα ὀνόματα familiar terms*, *οἱ ἀγοραῖοι the commonalty*, and that *τῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἀγοραίων* means 'deities of every degree, the great gods and the low'. This is a quite different division from *ὕπατοι—χθόνιοι*, 'gods of the upper and the nether world'. It is no objection to this that we sometimes find the epithet *Ἀγοραῖος* attached to the name of an Olympian, a *Zeus* or *Hermes Agoraios*. It was and is the policy of great polytheistic religions to attach to themselves the lower cults in this way, as may again be illustrated by the application of the name *Hermae* to objects of veneration much older than the god Hermes.—**τῶν ...τῶν**: the articles are added because

nether gods, the high gods and the low, the altars blaze with gifts, while on all sides the flames soar up to the sky, yielding to the innocent spell and soft persuasion of hallowed oil, rich from the store of kings. All this (so far as thou canst and mayst consent) do thou explain, and thus cure my present care, which vexes me now anon, although at whiles the sacrifices call up a kindly hope, and drive from my mind the unsated thought that still returns to the prey (?).

It is my right to tell—it is an encouragement upon their way permitted to them whose vigour is past, that still at their years

---

ὑπάτων, χθονίων, οὐρανίων, ἀγοραίων would have the appearance of a fourfold division, instead of two antitheses, based on different principles.

94. **ἁγνοῦ** *hallowed*, not merely 'pure'. The poet has in view those costly *χρίματα* of foreign, chiefly Oriental, production, which even in his own time were scarcely used but for religious purposes.

95. **παρηγορίαις**: cf. *παραθέλξει v.* 71.—**μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι** *in whose softness is no deceit*, contrasted epithets. Under this figure is suggested the hope, that the rejoicing, of which these things are a symbol, will not prove deceptive. But the speakers are unaware how very far from *ἄδολοι* the queen's persuasions are.

97. **ὅ τι...αἰνεῖν** *so far as thou canst and mayst consent* (to tell), supplied from *λέξασα*, not 'so far as thou canst and mayst tell (*αἰνεῖν*)'. In this sense *αἰνεῖν* for *λέγειν* is not used. So also Wecklein, "*αἰνεῖν*, sich zu etwas verstehen, zusagen".—**λέξασα...παιών τε γενοῦ** *i.e.* *γενοῦ λέξασα παιών τε* 'be the informant, and so the healer' etc. The periphrastic imperative, *γενοῦ* with aorist participle, is here seen in its original use, where it serves to express something not so easily put without it.—Others suppose that the clause corresponding to *παιών τε γενοῦ* is lost by anacoluthon (Wecklein); but this, in so short a sentence, seems unnatural.

100. **τελέθει** properly 'results in being', *i.e.* 'is on the whole' or 'on the balance'. So in Eur. *Med.* 1095 *εἶθ' ἡδὺ βροτοῖς, εἴτ' ἀνιαρὸν παῖδες τελέθουσι*. Now gloom, now hope, 'prevails'.

101—103. *ἥτις ἐστὶ θυμοβόρος λύπη τῆς φρενός* schol. on *v.* 103.—The reading is quite uncertain. *ἄπληστον* f. *ἀγανὴ* Karsten. *φανθεῖσ'* Pauw. As to the termination of *ἀγανά*, it is doubtful whether in such points poetry was regular, and there are traces of a certain tendency in *ν* to retain the *α*-sound, like that regularly exercised by *ρ*. Thus we have in Attic writing *ναμέρτης, ποινά-τωρ, εὐνάτωρ, νᾶμα, εὐνάσιμος, κυναγός, ναός, νάιος*.—For the last two lines Housman gives *ἐλπὶς ἀμύνει φροντίδ' ἄπληστον θυμοῦ, λυπησίφρον' ἄτην*, which, as he shows (*J. Ph.* XVI. p. 250) might not improbably give rise to the MS. and schol.

104. **κύριός εἰμι**: they turn for relief to certainties, and to that which is still within their power, the narration of the past.

105. **ὅδιον...ἐκτελέων** (in apposition to *θροεῖν*, or rather to the notion *κύριος εἶναι θροεῖν*, 'narration is the privilege and gift of old age') *an encouragement upon the way permitted to men whose vigour is past.* **ὅδιον** and **αἴσιον** apply properly to a favourable omen on a march or journey. **κράτος** 'strength' *i.e.* 'that which strengthens', see on *v.* 299. The application of the metaphor to the journey of life is suggested partly by the

ἐκτελέων· ἔτι γὰρ
θεόθεν καταπνεύει
πειθώ, μολπᾶν
ἀλκάν, ξύμφυτος αἰών—
ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν
δίθρονον κράτος, Ἑλλάδος ἥβαν
ξύμφρονε τάγα,
πέμπει σὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι
θούριος ὄρνις Τευκρίδ' ἐπ' αἶαν,
οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς
βασιλεῦσι νεῶν ὁ κελαινὸς
ὅ τ' ἐξόπιν ἀργίας
φανέντες ἴκταρ μελάθρων
χερὸς ἐκ δορυπάλτου
παμπρέπτοις ἐν ἕδραισιν,
βοσκόμενοι λαγίναν
ἐρικύματα φέρματι γένναν,
βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρόμων.

107. *καταπνε*ει.* 112—114 inserted by corrector m in space left by M.
112. *ξύμφρονα τὰν γᾶν.* 113. *καὶ χερὶ* omitted.

---

foregoing thoughts (*τρίποδας ὁδοὺς στείχει v.* 80) but chiefly by the coming story, which relates to a *ὅδιον κράτος αἴσιον* in the literal sense of the words. In *αἴσιον*, which means both *fortunate* and *permitted* (see *αἶσα*), there is a double suggestion.—**ἐκτελής**, here the opposite of *ἐντελής*, is a euphemism for *aged*: as *ὁ ἐντελής* is a man in his vigour or perfection, so *ὁ ἐκτελής* here is one who has passed that stage (cf. *ἔξηβος*). In Eur. *Ion* 780, by a different application of the notion 'finished' a young man is *ἐκτελὴς νεανίας* as opposed to a boy.—I think it clear that the parenthesis begins with *ὅδιον*, and not, as usually marked, with *ἔτι*. If *ὅδιον...ἐκτελέων* is referred directly to the omen afterwards related, there is no point in the epithet *ἐκτελέων*, however interpreted: and moreover the other punctuation is required by the general sense, for the speakers, as old men, have the right to *narrate* (or *sing*), not the right to tell this particular story.

106—108. *For still their age draws from heaven inspired persuasion, which is the strength of song*, *i.e.* in their eloquence the old retain a strength, when all other strength is gone. The thought of this passage, that mental and, as we might say, 'literary' gifts are the remaining consolation of old age, is closely illustrated, as well as the form of expression, by Eur. *H. F.* 673 foll. It may remind us that the poet was himself over sixty when the *Agamemnon* was composed.—**ξύμφυτος αἰών** 'the time born with them' or 'beginning from their birth', *i.e.* 'the age at which they are'; cf. *ὁ ξυνεύδων χρόνος* for 'the time of sleeping' *v.* 885

they draw from heaven that winning inspiration, which is the strength of song,—how the twin-throned Achæan Kings, concordant leaders of Hellas' youth, were sped with avenging arm and spear to the Teucrian land by a gallant omen, when to the kings of ships appeared the black king of birds and the white-backed king together, seen near the palace on the spear-hand in conspicuous place, feasting on hares, then full of young, stayed one course short of home.

(Enger). The abstraction 'age' is put for 'the aged' according to a common habit of the language.—**καταπνεύει** (or **καταπνείει**: the latter MSS. have καταπνεύει, in M the letter is uncertain; both forms are good) '*inhales*, draws down breath' not 'breathes down upon'. πνεῖν and its compounds (see ἐμπνεῖν, εἰσπνεῖν, ἀναπνεῖν) mean either 'inhale' or 'exhale' according to the context.—The forms in this passage are notably ambiguous: πειθω, μολπαν, αλκαν are all uncertain in case, and the two last may easily be read as datives (μολπᾷ). Hence many corrections (see Wecklein), but the traditional accentuation appears to be correct.—Wecklein interprets πειθώ to be the *confidence* or *trust* which encourages them to tell the following story. But the sentiment should from the context be one applicable to old men in general.

111. **ἥβαν**: for the plural cf. Eur. *Ion* 476 τέκνων νεανίδες ἧβαι. An abstract used in concrete sense is sometimes singular, sometimes plural.—**Ἑλλάδος** substantive.—Aristophanes (*Frogs* 1285) citing the verse gives the singular, Ἑλλάδος ἥβας.

112. **ξύμφρονε τάγα** (τάγης) or, as Dindorf, **ταγώ** (ταγός). The schol. τὴν ὁμόφρονα περὶ τὰ τακτικά assumes the abstract form ξύμφρονα ταγάν (ταγή), contrary to the metre.—**ξύμφρον' ἀρωγάν** (W. Headlam *Class. Rev.* XII. 245) is certainly a more poetical expression.

113. **πέμπει** historic present.—**καὶ χερὶ** dropped accidentally from recurrence of the syllable -ρι, restored from Aristoph. *Frogs* 1288.

114. **θούριος ὄρνις** *a gallant omen*, transferring to the omen the feeling it produces.

115. **οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς...φανέντες** *the appearance of etc.*, in apposition to ὄρνις. See on *Theb.* 611.

116. The difference between the birds, the black and the white-backed, is doubtless symbolical. The meaning must depend on the reading and interpretation of *v.* 126.

117. **τε** because the aptness of the omen lay in the appearance of the two different birds together.—δὲ (Hartung) would be regular for 'one black and the other' etc., but is here alien from the meaning and inconsistent with the use of the singular βασιλεύς. With δὲ we should expect, as some would write, the plural βασιλῆς.—**ἀργίας** *white-marked*: the termination is common in words describing the marks of animals: cf. ἐρυθρίας (ἐρυθρός), Ξανθίας the slave-name (ξανθός), both like ἀργίας (ἀργός) from colours, κοππατίας, στεμματίας etc.—**ἀργᾶς** (ἀργάεις, ἀργήεις *white*) Thiersch, for metre, rightly, if we may assume that Aeschylus would not allow the pronunciation *arg-yas*.

119. ἐκ δεξιᾶς, ὅ ἐστιν εὐσυμβόλως, schol.—**δορυπάλτου** 'spear-shaking', gen. of δορυπάλτης, cf. λαγοδαίτης *v.* 128. δοριπάλτου Turnebus; but it is not proved that the spelling of Aeschylus was always consistent.

121. **λαγίναν γένναν** *hares* (not *a hare*). For the periphrasis, in which γέννα means *stock* or *kind* (not *offspring*) cf. ἀρσένων γέννα *males* (Eur. *Med.* 428), Κενταύρων

αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.
κεδνὸς δὲ στρατόμαντις ἰδὼν δύο *ἀντ. α'.*
λήμασι δισσοὺς
Ἀτρεΐδας μαχίμους
ἐδάη λαγοδαίτας
πομπούς τ' ἀρχάς·
οὕτω δ' εἶπε τεράζων·
χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ
Πριάμου πόλιν ἅδε κέλευθος·
πάντα δὲ πύργων
κτήνη πρόσθε τὰ δημιοπληθῆ
μοῖρα λαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον.
οἷον μή τις ἄγα
θεόθεν κνεφάσῃ προτυπὲν στό-

124. *αἴλινον* (once only) throughout. 128. *λογοδαίτας.* 134. *προσθετά.* 136. *ἄτα.*

γέννα Centaurs (id. *H. F.* 365), *γέννα Φρυγῶν Phrygians* (id. *Tro.* 531), *σὰν Ἀσιητίδα γένναν thee, an Asiatic* (id. *Andr.* 1010).—**βοσκόμενοι . . δρόμων** *feeding on hares, creatures full-teemeing with young, which they had caught in the moment of escape,* literally 'stopped from their last runs'.—Mr. Platt (*Class. Rev.* XI. p. 94) refers to Xen. *Cyneg.* V. 14 (of hares) *οἱ δὲ ἤδη ἔτειοι τάχιστα θέουσι τὸν πρῶτον δρόμον, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους οὐκέτι.*—**ἐρικύματα** from *ἐρικύματος*, cf. *πολυσπέρματος* (Theophrastus); these forms are rare in the older writers, but there is no reason to fix any particular date for their first appearance. The neuter plural stands in apposition to the plural phrase *λαγίναν γένναν*, the neuter (*things, creatures*) being used for pathos.—**δρόμων** is a true plural, the 'runs' of the hares respectively. The fact expressed in *βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρόμων* is part of the symbol. The Trojans were almost to escape their enemies, and were at last only caught by the pretence of abandoning the attempt.—I think the text here correct. The assumptions which have created difficulty are (1) that *ἐρικύματα* is an error, (2) that the two eagles have but one hare, inferred apparently from *v.* 142, where see note. As to (1), the schol. gives the interpretation *πολυκύμονα*, but this no more implies that the text had *-κύμονα* than that it had *πολυ-*. The interpreter naturally uses the commoner form in both parts. On these assumptions some read (with recc.) *ἐρικύμονα* (fem. sing.) *φέρματι*, and explain the gender of *βλαβέντα* (masc. sing.) as referring to the meaning (*τὸν λαγών*) of *λαγίναν γένναν.* But this is to play fast and loose with *τὸ σημαινόμενον*. The meaning of *λαγίναν γένναν* is *ex hypothesi* feminine, and the fact that Greek had no distinct word for the female hare is nothing to the matter. Others therefore (Turnebus, Hartung) read *ἐρικύμονα φέρματα* and interpret this either of the mother-hare, which *φέρμα* (*fetus*) will not admit, or of the unborn offspring, which *βλαβέντα δρόμων* will not admit.

124. **αἴλινον** the burden of a dirge.—

Be sorrow, sorrow spoken, but still let the good prevail!

Then the good seer, who followed the host, when he saw how the two brave Atridae were in temper (?) twain, took cognizance of those hare-devouring birds and of the princely captains, and thus he read the prodigy: 'After long time they that here go forth must win King Priam's town, though ere they pass the wall all their cattle, their public store, shall perforce be divided and consumed. Only may no divine displeasure fore-smite and overcloud the gathering of the host, whose might should bridle

---

In English we should make the first clause dependent, 'Though sad words must be said, yet let what is good prevail'. See on *v.* 360.

125—129. See Appendix C.

128. **ἐδάη......ἀρχάς** lit. 'understood the hare-devourers and the conducting powers', *i.e.* understood the combination of the two pairs (see on *τε* in *v.* 117) and perceived the parallel.—**λαγοδαίτας** f.

133—135. The besieging army shall consume their provisions before Troy, and be reduced to the last straits. Calchas *infers* this from the fierce hunger of the typical eagles. (So also Wecklein.)—**πύργων...πρόσθε** *before* i.e. *outside* the wall, so *πρόσθε πυλᾶν Theb.* 512.—**κτήνη** *beasts*, here as always (Paley). *κτήματα* schol. here, and *κτήνη· χρήματα* Hesych. The one note explains the source of the other.—**μοῖρα** *division*, *distribution*, 'partitio' (Klausen). For similar uses of *μοῖρα* in its concrete sense (*part*) see Eur. *Med.* 430 and note there. Sophocles describes these herds, the supply of the Greek host before Troy, as *συμμικτὰ λείας ἄδαστα* 'the mingled spoil of forage, not yet divided' (*Ai.* 54).—**τὰ δημιοπληθῆ**: *πλῆθος a mass* is correlative to *μοῖρα*. By distribution the supply ceases to be *δήμιος* and to be a *πλῆθος*.—**πρὸς τὸ βίαιον** = *πρὸς βίαν* or *βιαίως perforce* (not *violently*).—To refer *κτήνη* with the schol. to the wealth of Troy requires us to neglect *μέν...δέ* and to mistranslate *κτήνη* and *πύργων*, and leaves unexplained how Calchas inferred from the portent that the enterprise would take a long time. See also *v.* 343.

136—144. A further suggestion from the portent. The cruel feast of the eagles is an offence against the kindly law of Nature, represented by Artemis *Εἰλείθυια* the patroness of the young and of pregnancy. The seer therefore cannot but recall that 'the house of the eagles', which is being interpreted 'of the Atridæ', has affronted the same power by another unnatural banquet (the Thyestean feast); and he forebodes disaster from this source. The allusion is guarded, but comes out more clearly below (*v.* 158 *σπευδομένα θυσίαν ἑτέραν* (*a second*) *ἄνομόν τιν' ἄδαιτον*. The prophet fears that the old sin may be made to 'breed another like itself' according to the doctrine of *v.* 755.—The question here, as Paley well puts it, is 'how Calchas infers the anger of the goddess against the Atridæ from the destruction of a hare by the eagles, unless the Atridæ *had already* committed some crime, of which that destruction was the symbol?' I suggest the above as the answer.—Sophocles (*El.* 566) gives another account of the matter; Agamemnon had offended Artemis by killing a sacred doe; and the change is interesting. The sin is thus small, so that Agamemnon, as is necessary from the point of view of the *Electra*, is not gravely compromised, while, such as it is, it is personal to himself, so that we are not driven to the characteristic doctrine of this play, that one man's sin tends to produce sin in others.

136. **ἄγα** Hermann. *Only may no divine displeasure fore-smite and overcloud the gathering of the host, whose might*

μιον μέγα Τροίας
στρατωθέν. οἴκῳ γὰρ ἐπί-
φθονος Ἄρτεμις ἁγνὰ
πτανοῖσιν κυσὶ πατρός,
αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου
μογερὰν πτάκα θυομένοισιν·
στυγεῖ δὲ δεῖπνον αἰετῶν.
αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.
τόσσων περ εὔφρων, καλά, ἐπῳδ.
δρόσοισιν ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν ἐόντων
πάντων τ' ἀγρονόμων φιλομάστοις
θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοισι τερπνά,
τούτων αἰτεῖ ξύμβολα κρᾶναι·
δεξιὰ μὲν κατάμομφα δὲ
φάσματα στρουθῶν.

147. ἀέλπτοις. ὄντων.

---

should bridle Troy. Literally 'the assembling of (what is to be) the mighty curb of Troy'. Note the collision of metaphors in *κνεφάσῃ στόμιον*: but in thought the metaphors do not touch, for what is really 'over-clouded' is not the 'bridle' but *ἡ στράτωσις*, the gathering of the host. Nevertheless the juxtaposition is bold and more in the manner of Pindar.—**στρατωθέν** in the camp at Aulis before departure (Hermann).—**προτυπέν** 'smitten beforehand, too soon'.

139. **οἴκῳ...κυσὶ πατρός**: *τῷ οἴκῳ τῶν κυνῶν Διός* schol. For the two datives, one in effect a possessive, see *Theb.* 167 *στρατῷ......πυργηρουμένῃ πόλει*, 621 *πύργοις...χθονί* and notes there.—**οἴκῳ** marks that the speaker refers to a hereditary, not a personal, offence in the Atridæ.—*οἴκτῳ* Scaliger—*ὀκνῶ γάρ*, 'for I have misgivings' W. Headlam *Class. Rev.* XIV. 115.

142. *Who sacrifice a poor trembling creature with all her unborn young.* **θυομένοισιν.** The middle form *θύομαι*, signifying properly 'to sacrifice for one's purpose' or 'with a certain ulterior object', is technical for sacrifices of divination. (See L. and Sc. *s. v.*) It is applied therefore naturally to the act of the eagles, as Calchas expounds it. But in *θυομένοισιν*, as in *οἴκῳ* and again in *δεῖπνον*, the type and antitype are mixed together. The 'house', the 'sacrifice', and the 'banquet' (*δεῖπνον*, a word proper to men, not animals, and applied to the Thyestean feast in *v.* 1601) are really those of the Atridæ and of Atreus.—**πτάκα** used not merely as a synonym of *λαγώς*, but in its full sense (see *πτήσσω*).—The use of the singular here is no evidence that there was but one hare (see *v.* 121). Whether there was one or two, the singular in this generic description is rhetorically proper. The wickedness lay in killing a pregnant mother, not in killing two animals.

144. **δεῖπνον αἰετῶν** *such a banquet of eagles.* So we must render it to give the full effect. *αἰετῶν*, being superfluous

Troy. For the wrath of holy Artemis rests on the house of those winged coursers of her sire, who sacrifice a poor trembling mother with all her young unborn. She loathes such a feast of eagles.

'Be sorrow, sorrow spoken, but still let the good prevail!

'Yea, fair one, loving though thou art unto the uncouth whelps of many a fierce breed, and sweet to the suckling young of all that roam the field, yet to this sign thou art prayed to let the event accord. Auspicious are these eagle-omens, but not with-

---

(for the possessive 'their' would be supplied from the context), is necessarily emphatic. 'The banquet' (see preceding note) was fit only for creatures of prey.

146—152. An appeal to the goddess not to interfere with the fulfilment of the portent *such as it is*. The portent, it is noted, does not promise unmixed good, but only good with evil, a victory after much suffering (see *vv.* 131—135), so that her displeasure may be satisfied without delaying the fleet and so causing the horrible sacrifice of Iphigenia.

146—148. See Appendix D. **τόσσων** an 'epic' form: τόσον recc.—**καλά** *fair one* (if right) is a propitiatory invocation, like the ὦ καλέ and ὠγαθέ of common conversation. Sidgwick and Wecklein also punctuate thus. ὦ καλά Weil. ἁ καλὰ recc.—κάκαλὰ (see ἄκαλος) Platt *Class. Rev.* XI. p. 95.—**δρόσοισιν** imitated, according to the schol., from ἕρσαι (*lambs*) in *Od.* 9. 222. If so, it is an odd specimen of a poet's science. ἕρση *a lamb* and ἕρση or ἔρση *dew* have probably no connexion; but Aeschylus apparently took ἕρση *a lamb* to mean properly 'that which is *dropped*' and extended the analogy to δρόσος. Cf. ἑδώλια for θάλαμος *bower* in *Theb.* 442.—**ἀέπτοις** *rough*, *uncouth*, from the stem ἑπ-, primarily 'that which cannot be handled, or dealt with' (see Dr Leaf on ἕπειν and ἕπεσθαι in *J. Phil.* XIV. 231). Hermann rightly defends this word against proposed change.—M has ἀέλπτοις but its archetype seems to have had ἀέπτοις, like f, for the schol. to M explains not ἀέλπτοις but ἀέπτοις.—**ἐόντων**: see Appendix D. **λεόντων** Stanley, from *Etym. Mag.* 377 Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι τοὺς σκύμνους τῶν λεόντων δρόσους κέκληκε.

149. **τερπνά** *sweet*, *delightful*, because kindly; nom. fem.—If taken as a neuter with the next clause it spoils the emphasis.

150. *Still thou art prayed*, *seeing what this portent is*, *to permit an answering accomplishment*, a cumbrous version, but we cannot with much less effect what the Greek does simply by throwing the stress on τούτων, and thus giving it a predicative force, 'this, being what it is.' —**ξύμβολα**: any two things which *tally* are ξύμβολα to each other; here the event is to tally with the sign, in which case, it is suggested, the goddess should be satisfied, because δεξιὰ μέν (ἐστι) κατάμομφα δὲ φάσματα.—**αἰτεῖ**: for the passive see Thuc. 2. 97 καὶ αἴσχιον ἦν αἰτηθέντα μὴ δοῦναι ἢ αἰτήσαντα μὴ τυχεῖν, and L. and Sc. *s. v.* As used here it has the same effect as in English. The speaker does not put his request directly but pleads that it is reasonable.—**δεξιὰ μέν κτλ.**, as an explanatory comment on τούτων (see above), has properly no conjunction.—The objections and conjectures made here seem to arise (1) from not perceiving that αἰτεῖ is passive, (2) from mis-joining δεξιὰ...στρουθῶν to the previous sentence.

152. **φάσματα στρουθῶν** *the portents of the birds*, *i.e.* the omen obtained by the eagles (see θυομένοισι), or in plain language, by the Atridæ, in whose name he appeals. For the sense of the genitive

ἰήιον δὲ καλέω Παιᾶνα,
μή τινας ἀντιπνόους
Δαναοῖς χρονίας ἐχενηΐδας
ἀπλοίας τεύξῃ,
σπευδομένα θυσίαν
ἑτέραν ἄνομόν τιν᾽, ἄδαιτον,
νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφυτον,
οὐ δεισήνορα. μίμνει
γὰρ φοβερὰ παλίνορτος
οἰκονόμος δολία,
μνάμων μῆνις τεκνόποινος.
τοιάδε Κάλχας ξὺν
μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς ἀπέκλαϝξεν
μόρσιμ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ὀρνίθων
ὁδίων οἴκοις βασιλείοις·
τοῖς δ᾽ ὁμόφωνον
αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπέ, τὸ δ᾽ εὖ νικάτω.
Ζεύς—ὅστις ποτ᾽ ἐστίν, εἰ τόδ᾽ αὐ- στρ. α΄.

165. ἀπέκλαιξεν.

---

see Eur. *El.* 710 τυράννων φάσματα, where the τύραννοι are Atreus and Thyestes (so that the use may well be a reminiscence) and the φάσμα is the golden lamb.—στρουθῶν is generally declared (after Porson) corrupt, on grounds which I cannot help thinking unsubstantial. (1) The metre, it is assumed, must be dactylic. But as the passage is not strophic, the metre is unknown. There is nothing unrhythmical in the text. (2) 'στρουθός, since it meant *a sparrow*, could not mean *an eagle*'. The same argument would prove that it could not mean *an ostrich* or *a dove*. The variety of its meanings shows that originally it meant simply 'a bird', and like other synonymous words, was variously limited in various places. Here we find it in its proper sense. (3) The insertion of στρουθῶν is accounted for by recollection of the partly similar story about the serpent and the birds (στρουθοί) in Homer (*Il.* 2. 311). The likelihood of this we need not criticize. If the word could not be genuine here, we might enquire whence it came, but till that is shown, the fact that it *might* have been inserted is immaterial. The derivation itself seems far-fetched.

153. *But oh, in the name of the Healing God, do not thou etc.* The appeal is still to Artemis, who is entreated to remember her near connexion with Apollo the God of Mercy. **τεύξῃ** 2nd pers. subj. from ἐτευξάμην (for the form see L. and Sc. *s. v.*) not 3rd pers. from ἔτευξα. The middle voice has the same force as in σπευδομένα.—This was the ancient interpretation (ὦ Ἄρτεμι, schol. on 156, does not imply the reading τεύξῃς as Hermann infers) and seems

out a flaw. But oh, in the blessed name of the Healer, raise thou not hindering winds, long to delay from the seas the Argive fleet; urge not a second sacrifice, foul offering of forbidden meat, which shall put hate between flesh and bone and break marital awe. For patient, terrible, never to be laid, is the wrath of the wife still plotting at home revenge for the unforgotten child.'

In such wise Calchas darkened his chant of high promise to the royal house from the omens of the march; and so with according burden

Be sorrow, sorrow spoken, but still let the good prevail!

'Zeus'—Power unknown, whom, since so to be called is his

---

preferable in feeling to the recent view that Apollo is asked to prevent the intention of Artemis. Moveover on such a point, if any, ancient tradition should be respected.

154. **τινας**, 158 **τινα**: the vagueness of foreboding.

157. **σπευδομένα** the reflexive form (*for thyself*), not *σπεύδουσα*, because the ultimate object would not be the death of the victim but the satisfaction of Artemis' wrath.—**θυσίαν ἑτέραν**: that of Iphigenia. —**ἄδαιτον**: that may not, like an ordinary lawful sacrifice, be partaken of.

159. **νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφυτον**: a difficult and obscure phrase, literally 'inbred maker of hatred', or *maker of hatred in the very flesh*. Some (as Wecklein) render it by 'creator of hatred between near friends', *Stifter von Hader unter den Angehörigen*, *i.e.* the husband and wife, Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra, comparing Soph. *Ant.* 794 *νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον*. This would be simple according to Greek habit of expression, if husband and wife were called *σύμφυτοι*, which however does not appear to be ascertained, though the examples given in L. and Sc. *s. vv. σύμφυτος, συμφύω*, especially the Platonic examples, will show that it is not unlikely.—*Clinging*, *inseparable* (Paley, Hermann, Klausen) comes to the same thing by a different road.

160. **οὐ δεισήνορα** *rebelling against the husband*: by a bold figure the act of sacrifice, personified, is treated as a living agent, and takes the qualities of the true agent (the wife) who carries out the effect of it. The language is intentionally obscure, language of prophecy, fully intelligible only in the light of the event. —**μίμνει**: the subject is still the living crime, embodied in the avenging wife and mother.

164. **τοιάδε** takes an adverse sense from the opposition to **ξὺν μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς**: with much good there was *this*; hence **τοῖς δ' ὁμόφωνον**, *v.* 168.—**ἀπέκλαγξεν** (recc.) **ἀπό**: the preposition depends on *μόρσιμα*, 'predictions deduced from'.

170. The narrative at this point comes face to face with a mystery, upon which the poet pauses. How shall the religious mind explain to itself such an event as the sacrifice of Iphigenia? On the one hand Agamemnon received divine warning against it; on the other hand he was fearfully tempted to commit it, and this by divine act and in consequence of sin not his own. Why should guilt be visited, as it is, beyond the guilty? Why does the Divinity permit, nay, sometimes seem to bring about, the evil which he denounces? In the last resort we can answer these questions only 'by casting off the burden of vanity in the name of the Almighty' (*v.* 175), that is, in the language of later theology, by faith. So much however we see, that evil itself is

τῷ φίλον κεκλημένῳ,
τοῦτό νιν προσεννέπω.
οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι
πάντ' ἐπισταθμώμενος
πλὴν Διός, εἰ τὸ μάταν
ἀπὸ φροντίδος ἄχθος
χρὴ βαλεῖν ἐτητύμως.
οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, ἀντ. α'.
παμμάχῳ θράσει βρύων,
οὐδ' ἐλέγξεται πρὶν ὤν,
ὃς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφυ, τριακ-
τῆρος οἴχεται τυχών.
Ζῆνα δέ τις προφρόνως
ἐπινίκια κλάζων
τεύξεται φρενῶν τοπάν·
τὸν φρονεῖν βροτοὺς ὁδώ- στρ. β'.
σαντα τῷ πάθει μάθος
θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν.
στάζει δ', ἔνθ' ὑπνῷ, πρὸ καρδίας

175. τόδε. 180. οὐδὲν λέξαι. 184. κλάζων. 185. τὸ πᾶν. 189. ἐν θ' ὕπνῳ.

---

an instrument of moral discipline, perhaps the only possible, and, if so, a mercy after all (*v.* 192). Religious tradition shadows forth such a doctrine, when it tells us on the one hand that there is one Power over all, and on the other hand that this Power itself has been developed out of a struggle, and that the present order of things stands upon the ruin of previous experiments. Thus does Aeschylus spiritualize the uncouth legends of the ancient cosmogony with its strange succession of brutal deities.—The structure of the passage, though simple, is not perfectly continuous. Ζεύς in *v.* 170 is the projected subject to the statement 'Zeus has decreed that wisdom should come by experience', but this statement is deferred, in order to set forth the legends and suggest the point of view from which they are to be regarded, and finally appears (*v.* 186) in a slightly modified shape.

'Zeus—meaning thereby that unknown Power, whose pleasure it is to be so called'. **αὐτῷ** *to himself.*

173. **οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι ... πλὴν Διός** literally 'I can make no other guess for the purpose but *Zeus*' *i.e.* I can think of no other to trust, but in the one Almighty is my only resource. *προσεικάζω* here is not 'to compare', or 'liken *to*', but 'to conjecture with a view to' the purpose explained in *vv.* 175—177.—'I can liken none but Zeus to Zeus' (Wecklein). This is nearly the same, but leaves the dependence of *εἰ κτλ.* somewhat obscure.

174. **πάντ' ἐπισταθμώμενος** *in deep pondering upon all things.* **πάντα** *the*

own pleasure, I by that name address. When I ponder upon all things, I can conjecture nought but 'Zeus' to fit the need, if the burden of vanity is in very truth to be cast from the soul. Not he, who perhaps was strong of yore and flushed with victorious pride, could now be so much as proved to have had being: and he that came next hath found his conqueror and is gone. But whoso to Zeus by forethought giveth titles of victory, the guess of his thoughts shall be right. And Zeus it is who leadeth men to understanding under this law, that they learn a truth by the smart thereof. The wound, where it lies dormant, will bleed, and its aching keep before the mind the memory of

---

universe as in Eur. *Med.* 411 *δίκα καὶ πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται nature and the universe are turned upside down*, where see note.—**ἐπι-** *over and over.*

175. **τὸ μάταν...ἄχθος** *the burden* '*in vain*', that is, the burden, in the language of *The Preacher*, of 'vanity', the oppressive sense of futility which must accompany a belief that the moral problem of the world is insoluble.—**τὸ** Pauw.

177. **ἐτητύμως** *in the fullest sense.* As to the use here of this 'etymological' term, and the light which it may throw on the source from which Aeschylus drew the form of his thought, I have written in Appendix II. to my edition of the *Seven Against Thebes*. The etymological origin of the thought, even if it be, as I think, certainly traceable, has little effect on the present application of it. For an adverse criticism of the whole position see Dr W. Headlam *On Editing Aeschylus*, pp. 138 foll.

178—185. According to Greek tradition Zeus and the dynasty of Zeus were the third in succession to supreme power, having expelled Kronos, father of Zeus (*ὃς ἔπειτ' ἔφυ*), who had expelled his father Ouranos (*ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν*). Aeschylus, relieving the legend of its grotesque details, reproduces it so as to mark the two points which he requires, that there is a Supreme Ruler, and that he won his position by a contest.

178. **ὅστις** vague, 'he, whate'er he was, who'. This earliest power has almost ceased to be discernible even in tradition.

179. **παμμάχῳ** *victorious*: but the word is used, like *τριακτήρ* and *ἐπινίκια*, to sustain the metaphor from gymnastic contests: *πάμμαχος* was specially associated with the *παγ-κράτιον* (see L. and Sc. *s. v.*).—**βρύων.** *βρύω to teem, to sprout* describes generally richness and fulness of life and is here applied to *animal* vigour: cf. the metaphor of the sap in *v.* 77.

180. **οὐδ' ἐλέγξεται πρὶν ὢν** (Margoliouth) *will scarce be proved to have once been*, literally 'will not so much as be proved', an expressive phrase for destruction which has left no trace.—**ὤν**: *imperfect* participle.—This seems the best restoration suggested. It is as near to the MS. as *οὐδὲ λέξεται* and better in sense.

181. **τριακτῆρος** properly a wrestler who throws his opponent three times, thus winning the victory. See *Eum.* 592.

183—185. *But he that by forecast giveth titles* (**κλᾴζων**) *of victory to Zeus, shall be right in the guess of his thought*, or, if **κλάζων** be read 'he that singeth the hymn of victory to Zeus.' In plain words 'Zeus may be trusted in all.' See Appendix E.

186—188. *Who leadeth men to understanding under this law, that they learn a truth by the suffering of it.* This is one sentence, in which **ὁδώσαντα** is the principal verb and **θέντα** a subordinate

μνησιπήμων πόνος·
καὶ παρ' ἄκοντας ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν.
δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις βιαίως
σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων.
καὶ τόθ' ἡγεμὼν ὁ πρέ- ἀντ. β΄.
σβυς νεῶν 'Αχαιικῶν,
μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων,
ἐμπαίοις τύχαισι συμπνέων,
εὖτ' ἀπλοίᾳ κεναγ-
γεῖ βαρύνοντ' 'Αχαιικὸς λεὼς
Χαλκίδος πέραν ἔχων παλιρρό-

---

participle, equivalent to ὃς ὤδωσε...θεὶς κτλ.—**ὁδώσαντα**: gnomic aorist.—In the second and properly participial clause, the emphasis is on τῷ πάθει, constructed as instrumental with μάθος. The whole phrase τῷ πάθει μάθος (*learning by the suffering*) is the subject of κυρίως ἔχειν *to be established*.—**τὸν...ὁδώσαντα, τὸν... θέντα** Schütz, a doubtful change, though attractive at first sight and followed in many texts. The clause τὸν...ὁδώσαντα should not be a separate proposition; the point is not that Zeus teaches mankind, but that he has imposed upon them one universal condition of learning. See next note.

189—191. *For it bleeds, where it lies dormant, an ache that keeps before the mind the memory of the hurt.* The admonitory recollection of experience is compared to a wound which long afterwards will ache at times and even break out again, reminding the sufferer of the original hurt. The subject to **στάζει** is τὸ πάθος (as is clear if τῷ πάθει be retained in the preceding clause) which passes in the metaphor into the restricted sense of *a hurt*: cf. *Eum.* 499 πολλὰ παιδότρωτα πάθεα.—**πόνος** stands in apposition to the subject.—**πρὸ καρδίας** depends upon μνησιπήμων.—**ἔνθ' ὑπνῷ** literally *wherever it sleeps*, *i.e.* wherever there is such a dormant hurt. ὑπνῷ is the Doric contraction for ὑπνόῃ (or for ὑπνόει indicative). The intransitive use of ὑπνόω is Homeric, but like many other archaic forms and usages does not appear in prose until after the best age.—The language here is all taken from the poetical vocabulary of medicine, and may be illustrated from the *Philoctetes* and elsewhere. For στάζειν *to ooze*, *break out* see *Phil.* 783 στάζει γὰρ αὖ μοι φοίνιον τόδε ...κηκῖον αἷμα: and for the application of the word to that from which the flowing comes see *Cho.* 1056 ἐξ ὀμμάτων στάζουσιν αἷμα δυσφιλές. For the metaphor of *sleep* applied to a *dormant* pain which ceases and recurs see *Phil.* 649 φύλλον ᾧ κοιμῶ τόδ' ἕλκος: for πόνος *pain*, *ache* *Phil.* 637 καίριος σπουδὴ πόνου λήξαντος: for πῆμα *inf.* 841, Soph. *Ai.* 582 τομῶν πῆμα *a hurt that needs the knife*.—**ἔν θ' ὕπνῳ** (M) assumes the construction στάζει τε δὲ ἐν ὕπνῳ πόνος, καὶ ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν, *when in sleep the wound smarts*, *then wisdom comes* (τε καί=*simul ac*), where ὕπνος is or may be the real sleep of the sinner, night being the time of repentance. See Dr W. Headlam *Class. Rev.* XVII. 241.—**ἄκοντας** *without their will* rather than *against their will*, ἄκων being merely the negative of ἑκών. So θέλουσ' ἄκοντι κοινώνει κακῶν *take willingly thy part of*

the hurt, so that wisdom comes to them without their will. And it is perhaps a mercy from a Power, who came by struggle to his majestic seat.

Thus it was with the Achæan ammiral, the elder of the twain. A prophet, thought he, is not to blame; so he bent before the blast; and when his folk began to weary of hindering winds and empty cask, still lying over against Chalcis, where the tides

---

suffering with him who hath no will (*Theb.* 1024). The point here is not so much that men will not be wise as that except through suffering they perhaps could not.

192—193. *And it is perhaps a mercy from a Deity who came by struggle to his majestic seat.* The subject is still πάθος, suffering regarded as a discipline.—**βιαίως ...ἡμένων** 'to be seated by force' has two possible meanings, (1) 'to have taken a seat by force', (2) 'to have been forced to take a seat' ('to sit in might' is impossible). Here the context decides for the first.—**δαιμόνων.** The plural must not be pressed, and is in fact not correctly represented by a plural in English. Zeus only is in view, but the plural indicates (as usual) that the character or position rather than the person is described.—Note carefully the emphasis on δαιμόνων. The point is that heaven as well as earth is under the general law. This is the moral, or rather part of the moral, which the poet draws from the legendary theology which he has given in outline. The necessity of suffering as a discipline is perhaps taught by the tradition that the Deity itself has known progression and that 'Zeus' did not reign till he had first overcome.—**σέλμα**: the metaphor is perhaps from place in a ship (cf. *v.* 1615); ὑψίζυγος γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς schol. see Hom. *Il.* 8. 69 (Wecklein). But the use of σέλμα does not necessarily imply this.—δι' αἰῶς (=αἰῶνος?) H. V. Macnaghten, δι' αἰῶ (αἰῶνα) J. A. Platt. βίαιος or βιαία W. Headlam *l.c.*

194—227. The story is resumed, and proceeds in one sweeping period to the sacrifice of Iphigenia, the circumstances of which suggested the foregoing parenthesis. **καὶ τότε** *so on that occasion etc.* **ἡγεμὼν ὁ πρέσβυς.** The substance of the sentence here commenced is this, 'Agamemnon, in spite of the divine warning, resolved in the end to slay his child'. The verb comes in *v.* 215 (εἶπε), where, after long preliminary clauses, the main sentence is resumed with a δέ, and for more clearness the subject is repeated almost in the same words, ἄναξ ὁ πρέσβυς.

196—197. *Remembering that a prophet is not to blame* (for his message) *and bending to the buffets of fortune.* The old men, though unable to excuse the king's crime, make the best of his case, and give to his acquiescence this courteous turn. **μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων** literally 'blaming no prophet', embracing this particular case under the general rule.—Wecklein contrasts Hom. *Il.* 1. 106 μάντι κακῶν, οὔ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας. αἰεί τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι etc. (Agamemnon to Calchas), and observes that such opposition would have been more in place at Aulis.—**συμπνέων** 'blowing the same way as...': the metaphor seems to be taken, by contrast, from the act of struggling against the wind. **ἐμπαίοις**: a unique and obscure word, perhaps to be connected with παίω (ἐμπαισάσαις schol.): seemingly 'disposed to yield to fortune as it might strike'. Wecklein refers the metaphor to the beating of waves upon a ship.

198. **κεναγγεῖ.** As an ancient army depended almost entirely on foraging for provisions, to be detained on their own shore threatened starvation.

θοις ἐν Αὐλίδος τόποις·
πνοαὶ δ' ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος μολοῦσαι στρ. γ'.
κακόσχολοι, νήστιδες, δύσορμοι,
βροτῶν ἄλαι,
ναῶν καὶ πεισμάτων ἀφειδεῖς,
παλιμμήκη χρόνον τιθεῖσαι
τρίβῳ κατέξαινον ἄν-
θος Ἀργείων· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ
πικροῦ χείματος ἄλλο μῆχαρ
βριθύτερον πρόμοισιν
μάντις ἔκλαγξε προφέρων
Ἄρτεμιν, ὥστε χθόνα βάκτροις
ἐπικρούσαντας Ἀτρείδας
δάκρυ μὴ κατασχεῖν·—
ἄναξ δ' ὁ πρέσβυς τόδ' εἶπε φωνῶν· ἀντ. γ'.
βαρεῖα μὲν κὴρ τὸ μὴ πιθέσθαι,
βαρεῖα δ', εἰ
τέκνον δαΐξω, δόμων ἄγαλμα,
μιαίνων παρθενοσφάγοισιν
ῥεέθροις πατρῴους χέρας
βωμοῦ πέλας. τί τῶνδ' ἄνευ
κακῶν; πῶς λιπόναυς γένωμαι
ξυμμαχίας ἁμαρτών;
παυσανέμου γὰρ θυσίας
παρθενίου θ' αἵματος ὀργᾷ
περιόργως, ἐπιθυμεῖν
θέμις. εὖ γὰρ εἴη.

207. κατέξενον (αι written above; αι m). 216. πείθεσθαι.

---

203. **νήστιδες** *hungry*, because they make to hunger.

204. **βροτῶν ἄλαι** doubtful. Mr Housman would refer this ἄλη to the stem of ἀλέω *to grind*, and render it by *tribulation*. This gives a perfectly simple sense and is very attractive, although the known derivatives of this stem seem to be literal only, not metaphorical. That this ἄλη should coexist with ἄλη *wandering*, itself extremely rare and only poetical, is quite likely.—Those who take ἄλαι here to mean *wandering*, explain it as meaning that the winds make the men wander, either literally in search of forage, or metaphorically in their minds, *i.e.* drive

of Aulis rush to and fro, while still the gales blew thwart from Strymon, stayed them and starved them, and penned them in port, grinding the men and making of ship and tackle a prodigal waste, and with lapse of time, doubled over and over, still withering the flower of Argos away; then at last, when the prophet's voice pointed to Artemis, and told of yet one more means to cure the tempest's bane, a means pressing more on the princes, which made the sons of Atreus beat their staves upon the ground and let the tear roll down:—the elder then of the twain found voice and said:

'Sore is my fate if I obey not, and sore if I must slay my child, the jewel of my home, staining paternal hands with virgin stream from the victim at the altar's side. Are not the two ways woeful both? How can I fail my fleet and lose my soldiery? For eager is their craving that, to stay the winds, her virgin blood should be offered up, and well they may desire it. May it be for the best!' Offer of sacrifice

222. τι πῶς λιπόναυστε (text h).

---

them mad. But both explanations seem artificial.

205—208. On the metre see Appendix II. νεῶν Pauw, τε καὶ Porson.

208. **ἐπεί**: the subordinate clause commenced at εὖτε (*v.* 198) takes a fresh start.

211. **ἔκλαγξε**: for the tone of this word see on *v.* 184, Appendix E.—The lengthening of ε before πρ- is epic. ἔκλαγξεν Porson.—**προφέρων Ἄρτεμιν** 'putting forward Artemis', *i.e.* citing her demands as his reason and defence. See L. and Sc. *s. v.*

215. **δέ.** See on *v.* 194. For **τόδ'** Stanley **τότ'**. The adverb would be effective as resuming the previous τότε in *v.* 194. For τόδε see *v.* 418 (Wecklein).—**εἶπε φωνῶν** 'spake in words', or 'with articulate voice' (the proper meaning of φωνῶν), as contrasted with the 'unchecked tears' of the previous verse, in English *found voice and said.*

216. **τὸ μὴ πιθέσθαι** (Turnebus) *to refuse obedience* is more pointed than **τὸ μὴ πείθεσθαι** *to hold out*, and is favoured though not absolutely required by the metre.

220. **ῥεέθροις** pronounced ῥείθροις and so written in h.—On the metre see Appendix II.

222. **πῶς...γένωμαι**; 'how can I be?' *i.e.* 'how can I bear to be?'

224—226. *For eager is their craving that to stay the winds her virgin blood should be offered up, and well they may desire it.*—**ὀργᾷ** (see ὀργάω) has for subject συμμαχία, and takes the dependent genitives according to rule.—**ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις** literally 'it being permissible that they should desire it'. The use in this clause of the weaker word (ἐπιθυμεῖν as compared with ὀργᾶν) aids the intended point, 'they crave it eagerly, and for desiring it cannot be blamed', that is, their 'desire, however keen, is not unreasonable'. Agamemnon endeavours to persuade himself that he yields from a sense of duty.—For the absolute use of θέμις cf. the similar use of χρεών, a word parallel

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκας ἔδυ λέπαδνον — στρ. δ'.
φρενὸς πνέων δυσσεβῆ τροπαίαν
ἄναγνον, ἀνίερον, τόθεν
τὸ παντότολμον φρονεῖν μετέγνω.
βροτοῖς† θρασύνει γὰρ αἰσχρόμητις
τάλαινα παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων.
ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ
γενέσθαι θυγατρός, γυναικοποί-
νων πολέμων ἀρωγὰν
καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν.
λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληδόνας πατρῴους — ἀντ. δ'.
παρ' οὐδέν, αἰῶνα παρθένειον,
ἔθεντο φιλόμαχοι βραβῆς,
φράσεν δ' ἀόζοις πατὴρ μετ' εὐχὰν
δίκαν χιμαίρας ὕπερθε βωμοῦ
πέπλοισι περιπετῆ παντὶ θυμῷ

---

in its uses throughout, *e.g.* *οὐ χρεὼν ἄρχετε* Thuc. 3. 40, and see L. and Sc. *s. v.*—I suggest that this punctuation and construction remove the objections properly made if *πανσανέμου...θέμις* (*ἐστί*) be taken as one sentence, viz. (1) that *ἐπιθυμεῖν* requires a pronominal subject to show that the sentence is not general, and (2) that *ὀργᾷ* (dative of *ὀργή*) *περιόργως ἐπιθυμεῖν* is verbose. For proposed changes see Wecklein, Appendix.—*περιοργῶς* Blomfield, as from *περιοργής*. Either form is correct, and duplicate forms in both terminations are common.

227. **γὰρ** *then* (not *for*), in effect the English *well*.

230. **τόθεν...μετέγνω** *from that moment he took to his heart unflinching resolve.* Constr. *μετέγνω τὸ παντότολμον ὥστε φρονεῖν αὐτό.*—*μεταγιγνώσκω* here has an acc. object of the feeling assumed, not as more commonly of the feeling quitted (*μεταγιγνώσκειν ἄταν* *to repent* folly).

232—233. The reading is doubtful. M punctuates thus, ...*μετέγνω βροτοῖς· θρασύνει γὰρ*..., and has a schol. to *v.* 230 *ὅθεν ἔγνω πάντα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τολμᾶν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης δῆλον ὅτι*, which apparently assumes the same punctuation but, instead of *βροτοῖς*, the acc. *βροτούς*, translated by *τοὺς ἀνθρώπους*. That the preceding sentence ends at *μετέγνω* seems certain. The text commonly received is that of Spanheim ... **μετέγνω· βροτοὺς θρασύνει γὰρ**..., which is adopted provisionally in the translation, but is unsatisfactory because (among other reasons) the emphatic position of *βροτοὺς* is incorrect; it would seem to oppose *mortals*, who are emboldened by infatuation, to others (whom?) who are not.—In the former edition I read **βρότοις** (*sic*) **θρασύνει γὰρ**..., translating *For to put faith in the shedding of blood is an obstinate delusion*, literally, 'for by bloodshed takes confidence an obstinate delusion'. This, as further explained in my note, I still think possible; but it obviously depends on the assumption that the letters *βροτοις*

So, having put on his neck the harness of Necessity, his spirit set to the new quarter, impious, wicked, unholy, and from that moment he took to his heart unflinching resolve. For mortals (?) are emboldened by an obstinate delusion, whose base counsel is the beginning of sin. Howsoever he did not shrink from slaying a victim daughter, to aid war waged for a stolen wife, and to wed unto him his fleet!

Her prayers, her cries to her father, mere life-breath of a girl, the spectators, eager for battle, regarded not at all. Her father, after prayer, gave word to the ministers, while casting her robes about her she bowed herself desperately down, to lift her, as it

---

can be trusted. In view of the schol., which, as Dr Headlam observes, I overlooked, this is so uncertain, that I should now prefer to leave the problem unsolved.—**τάλαινα** *hard*, *obstinate*; see *v.* 396.

234. **δ' οὖν** *however*, for good or ill.

235. **θυγατρός, γυναικοποίνων.** The antithesis is significant, 'the daughter being a blood-relation, the wife a stranger' (Sidgwick), and moreover exposes the moral monstrosity of supporting a cause, which rested on the sanctities of the family, by an offence against those very obligations.

236. **ἀρωγὰν** in apposition to the action (*τὸ θύειν*) of the verb *θυτὴρ γενέσθαι*.

237. **προτέλεια**: see on *vv.* 65, 249. and Lucretius I. 96 foll. 'non ut sollemni more sacrorum perfecto posset (Iphigenia) claro comitari *Hymenaeo*, sed casta inceste *nubendi* tempore in ipso hostia concideret'.

238—240. *For her prayers and appeals to her father, (mere) life-breath of a girl, the spectators, eager for war, cared not at all.* **βραβῆς**: this word, of uncertain origin, seems to combine, like the Latin *arbiter*, the meanings of *judge* and *spectator* (Eur. *Hel.* 703, and see editor's note on Eur. *Med.* 274), the fundamental sense being probably *witness*. Here it means in full 'spectators on whom the decision depended'.—**αἰῶνα παρθένειον.** These words, as placed, should be related as an explanation to *παρ' οὐδὲν ἔθεντο*. This is adverse to the corrections *αἰῶνα παρθένειόν τ'* (*and her virgin life*) Elmsley, *αἰῶ τε παρθένειον* (O. Müller). *αἴαγμα παρθένειον* (Karsten) is admissible. But perhaps no change is required. That *αἰῶνα* should stand in apposition to *λιτὰς καὶ κληδόνας* seems unnatural to our ears because we (rightly as a matter of science) connect *αἰών* (*αἰϝών*) *life* with *aevum* and take it to mean *time*, *life-time*. But the Greek poets apparently associated it rather with *ἄημι* and *ἀίω* *to breathe*, and took it to mean properly *life-breath*. Thus Euripides actually has *ἀνέπνευσεν αἰῶνα* (*fr.* 787 Dindorf) *drew breath*, and the same conception underlies such phrases as *ψυχὴ καὶ αἰών*, *αἰὼν πέφαται*, *αἰῶνος στερεῖν*, which ignore the idea of 'time'. If *αἰῶνα* could mean, or even suggest, *breath*, the text here is not impossible, but expressive; and it must not hastily be dismissed.

243. **πέπλοισι περιπετῆ** *wrapped in* (*i.e.* wrapping herself in) *her robes*: contrast *v.* 249.—**προνωπῆ**: *προνενευκυῖαν* schol. *bent* or *bowed forward*.—**παντὶ... ἀέρδην** variously interpreted: (1) *drooping in all her soul* (suggested by Paley), (2) *to raise unfalteringly the drooping maid* (Sidgwick and the majority); 'the order of the words marks the sharp antithesis; they were to be eager, she was fainting with fear and grief' (S.), (3) *to raise her bowed* (*over the altar*) 'so as to

προνωπῆ λαβεῖν
ἀέρδην, στόματός τε καλλιπρῴ-
ρου φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν
φθόγγον ἀραῖον οἴκοις
βίᾳ χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει. στρ. ε'.
κρόκου βαφὰς δ' ἐς πέδον χέουσα
ἔβαλλ' ἕκαστον θυτή-
ρων ἀπ' ὄμματος βέλει
φιλοίκτῳ,
πρέπουσά θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, προσεννέπειν
θέλουσ', ἐπεὶ πολλάκις
πατρὸς κατ' ἀνδρῶνας εὐτραπέζους
ἔμελψεν, ἁγνᾷ δ' ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾷ
πατρὸς φίλου τριτόσπονδον εὔποτμον
παιᾶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.
τὰ δ' ἔνθεν οὔτ' εἶδον οὔτ' ἐννέπω· ἀντ. ε'.
τέχναι δὲ Κάλχαντος οὐκ ἄκραντοι·
δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦ-

256. ἁγνὰ. αὐδὰ. 258. αἰῶνα.

---

present her neck to the sacrificer' (Wecklein). None of these is quite satisfactory. The order of the words πέπλοισι...προνωπῆ suggests that παντὶ θυμῷ refers to the victim, and in fact makes any other interpretation seem artificial. An antithesis between παντὶ θυμῷ and προνωπῆ would have been satisfied just as well by the order προνωπῆ παντὶ θυμῷ, and this order would be natural, if παντὶ θυμῷ were constructed with λαβεῖν. This points to (1); but προνωπής, which describes an attitude not a state of mind, and παντὶ θυμῷ, which elsewhere means *energetically*, *resolutely*, will hardly bear the interpretation required. As to (3) we must note further that the sacrificer would strike the throat, not the back of the neck (see the sacrifice of Polyxena, Eur. *Hec.* 565—567, λαιμὸς εὐτρεπὴς ὅδε and τέμνει πνεύματος διαρροάς).—I would suggest for consideration the rendering *desperately bowed down*: the victim struggles with the energy of despair to retain her attitude and not to be raised into the posture for sacrifice with the throat exposed. This satisfies the order, and makes the two phrases πέπλοισι περιπετῆ, παντὶ θυμῷ προνωπῆ parallel, as by their arrangement they should be: both mark the struggle of the victim.

245. Constr. στόμ.-καλλ.-φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν φθόγγον κτλ., literally 'and, by way of guard upon her fair lips, they should restrain' etc. **φυλακὰν** is acc. in apposition to the action, see ἀρωγάν, *v.* 236. It is unusual that an accusative of this kind should stand before the verb which it explains, but it seems to be so meant here. Others make the acc. στόμα depend on φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν *to keep guard* (Wecklein). But against this is

were a kid, over the altar, and, for prevention of her beautiful lips, to stop the voice that might curse his house with the dumb cruel violence of the gag.

And she, as she let fall to earth her saffron robe, smote each one of the sacrificers with glance of eye that sought their pity, and seemed, like as in a painting, fain to speak: and oft indeed had she sung where men were met at her father's noble board, with pure voice virginally doing dear honour to the grace and blessing that crowned her father's feast.

What followed I saw not, neither do I tell. The rede of Calchas doth not lack fulfiment. Yet is it the law that only to

---

καταοχεῖν check.—**φυλακᾷ**, Blomfield, cuts the knot, and is perhaps right.—**καλλιπρῴρου**. See on *Theb.* 520.

248. **βίᾳ.. μένει.** This fine expression takes special emphasis from its position in the new strophe (Wecklein).

249. *Her robe of saffron*, the dress of a princess and a maiden. So Antigone unties 'the saffron splendour of her robe' *στολίδος κροκόεσσαν τρυφάν*, Eur. *Phoen.* 1491 (Sidgwick). There is perhaps also an allusion to the hymenaeal associations of the colour (see on *v.* 237). It does not appear whether Aeschylus knew or followed the story of the pretended marriage (see Eur. *Iph. Aul.*) by which Agamemnon brought his daughter to Aulis.—**δέ**: the position is natural, *κρόκου βαφὰς* being inseparable and in effect one word.—**χέουσα | ἔβαλλε**: see Appendix II.

253. **πρέπουσά τε**: joined with *χέουσα* because both the action and the mute look make an appeal to their pity for her youth and beauty. See Eur. *Hec.* 558 foll. (Wecklein.)

254. They knew the voice that would have spoken, and had reason to associate it with pathetic remembrance of her proud and happy maidenhood.—The connection marked by **ἐπεὶ** is often much looser than with our conjunctions of inference. Unless we supply the connecting link (as here 'and her look *was* vocal to them, for' etc.) we should render simply by 'and' or 'and indeed'.

258. **παιᾶνα** (Hartung, Enger). A banquet was followed by libations, usually three, the third to Zeus the Preserver (*Σωτήρ*). "With the end of the libations came the paean or song. So in Plato's Symposium, *ἔφη δειπνήσαντας σπονδὰς ποιήσασθαι, καὶ ᾄσαντας τὸν θεόν*..." (S.). The whole in fact was a sort of 'grace'. In all ritual acts, especially those connected like the paean with the worship of Apollo, personal purity was of great importance (see *Theb.* 156, 251, 254, Eur. *Ion* 150 *ὅσιος ἀπ' εὐνᾶς ὢν...Φοίβῳ λατρεύων*). Hence the emphasis here on *ἁγνᾷ ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾷ*. Whether the custom here implied, that the children, and particularly the virgins, of the family should sing or join in singing the 'grace', subsisted in Aeschylus' time, there is nothing to show positively. But it is natural and probable.

259. **τὰ δ' ἔνθεν** *what followed, i.e.* the sacrifice itself.

260. **τέχναι** *science, i.e.* his *divinations* as a seer by profession. Cf. Soph. *O. T.* 380 *τέχνη τέχνης ὑπερφέρουσα*. The immediate reference is to his suggestion of the sacrifice (*v.* 211), but the accomplishment of this raises also fears as to the threatened sequel (*v.* 160). Hence what here follows.

261. *It is the law, that to experience wisdom should fall, i.e.* that men should learn by their own sufferings, and seldom by anything else.—**δίκα** properly 'wont'

σιν μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει·
τὸ μέλλον
ἐπεὶ γένοιτ᾽ ἂν κλύοις· πρὸ χαιρέτω·
ἴσον δὲ τῷ προστένειν·
τορὸν γὰρ ἥξει σύνορθον αὐταῖς.
πέλοιτο δ᾽ οὖν τἀπὶ τούτοισιν εὖ, πρᾶ-
ξις ὡς θέλει· τόδ᾽ ἄγχιστον, Ἀπίας
γαίας μονόφρουρον ἕρκος.

264. ἐπιγένοιτ᾽. προχαιρέτω. 267. εὔπρα-.

'way' and here 'nature of things'; for this use see on Eur. *Med.* 411 καὶ δίκα καὶ πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται *nature and the universe are turned upside down.* The metaphor in ἐπιρρέπει (literally 'inclines') suggests a comparison between the laws of the moral world and those of the physical. Wisdom 'gravitates' (if we may use the anachronism) to experience.—The rendering 'justice' should be avoided. The 'law' is far from being manifestly just; on the contrary it raises, as Aeschylus has shown above, moral difficulties.

263—265. **ἐπεὶ** later MSS.—**πρὸ χαιρέτω** H. L. Ahrens.—*As for the future, one may hear it when it comes to pass, ere that, I care not for the hearing; 'tis but anticipating sorrow.* **κλύοις ἂν** is the principal verb, **γένοιτο** optative indefinite assimilated to κλύοις. The subject of **χαιρέτω** (literally 'let it be bidden good-bye' *i.e.* 'let it keep at a distance') is τὸ κλύειν supplied from κλύοις ἄν. **πρὸ** is adverbial. The same τὸ (πρὸ) κλύειν is the subject of **ἴσον (ἐστὶ) τῷ προστένειν** 'hearing of it before is equivalent to lamenting it before'.—The sentiment is directed against the usefulness of divination.—After μέλλον in M a later hand has inserted τὸ δὲ προσκλύειν. These words, excluded by the metre, have arisen from a marginal explanation of the following clauses.

266. *For it will come clear and right, when the science itself comes clear and right*; literally 'clear it will come, made right together with the divination itself'. The subject is still τὸ κλύειν. When the thing is accomplished, it will be told clearly and rightly. Till then the prophecy itself is never clear and cannot therefore be known to be right.—**αὐταῖς** emphatic. In Aeschylus this pronoun generally is so. We supply ταῖς τέχναις from *v.* 260; as the intervening sentences contain nothing to which αὐταῖς could be referred, and *divination* is the topic of the whole passage, this does not seem impossible, though it is obscure.—Prof. Goodwin also retains the text, and refers **αὐταῖς** to τέχναι, but renders thus 'the future will come clear in accord with them (the prophecies)'.—The received emendation **σύνορθρον αὐγαῖς** (Wellauer, Hermann) is possible, but unsafe. The subject is taken to be τὸ μέλλον, and the sentence explained thus: 'as the rising sun suddenly lightens the darkness, so will the fulfilment of the prophecy bring first and at once a clear confirmation' (Wecklein). But surely this sense is hard to extract from the words 'for the future will come clear, dawning together with the light'.—If the text is not sufficiently clear, I would read αὐτοῖς (dative of αὐτά, which is often used thus independently for 'the matter in question'), translating thus: 'for it (the hearing of events) will come clear and true when the events

experience knowledge should fall: when the future comes, then thou mayst hear of it; ere that, I care not for the hearing, which is but anticipating sorrow; it will come clear, hearing and prophecy both true together. Enough: let us pray for such immediate good, as present act requires. Here is our next concern, this fortress, sole protection of the Argive land.

---

themselves come'. This however I do not think necessary or desirable.

267—269. *Let us pray then for such immediate good, as the present occasion needs. Our nearest concern is this fortress, sole protection of the Argive land.* Dismissing (**δ' οὖν**) useless speculation as to the future, they turn to what is near and practical, the present safety of the fortress, exposed to special danger by the absence of its lord and, as hereafter appears, from the state of the country (*vv.* 463—466). It must be remembered that the elders are at present, as the following question shows, wholly ignorant as to the meaning or purpose of the nocturnal alarm. They do not even know whether, as the celebration suggests, *good* news has actually been received.—The antithesis of present and future is marked in three ways: (1) **τἀπὶ τούτοισιν** 'the *immediate* sequel', literally 'what comes next to this present': (2) **πρᾶξις ὡς θέλει** literally 'as practical action (business) demands'. **πρᾶξις** is here = *τὸ πρασσόμενον*, the matter in hand, the thing to be *done*, as opposed to what can only be matter of guessing or speculation. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1334 *μέλλοντα ταῦτα· τῶν προκειμένων τι χρὴ πράσσειν*. The stress upon *πρᾶξις*, and its pregnant force, are marked by the position of the word in its clause. Somewhat similar is the Homeric use of *οὔ τις πρῆξις πέλεται γόοιο* 'nothing *practical* comes of lamentation' (and see L. and Sc. *s.v.* *πρᾶξις*): (3) **τόδ' ἄγχιστόν (ἐστι)** *here is our nearest concern*; for *ἄγχιστον* 'nearest (in concern)' cf. *ὁ ἄγχιστος* 'the person most nearly concerned', Soph. *El.* 1105. It is best to take this as a separate sentence, but possible also without change of the meaning to take *τόδε...ἕρκος* as in apposition to *τἀπὶ τούτοισιν* 'the immediate matter, our nearest concern' etc.—**'Απίας γαίας...ἕρκος**: the fortress, citadel, or castle of the Atridae. Where precisely in the Argolid we are to suppose this, whether at the site of Argos or elsewhere, Aeschylus does not determine. The example of Sophocles (see commentaries on the prologue to the *Electra*) shows that such details were not within the knowledge of the audience (perhaps not of the poets) and would not have been appreciated. The play assumes nothing but such general facts, as could not but be intelligible, the plain, the sea, the mountains, and a fortress. For *'Απία γαῖα Argolis* see L. and Sc. *s.v.*: for *γαίας ἕρκος* cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 441 *ποῖον δὲ γαίας ἕρκος (city) οὐκ ἀφίγμεθα;*—These lines are generally given (by those who do not alter the words) thus: *πέλοιτο... εὔπραξις, ὡς θέλει...ἕρκος* 'let good fortune follow, as is the wish of this one sole defence of Argos, bound by close ties', the last words being taken to describe either the speakers or Clytaemnestra. But (1) *εὔπραξις* or *εὖ πρᾶξις* for *εὐπραγία*, is an incorrect form: this objection has been frequently raised and many emendations are based on it: and further (2) *γαίας ἕρκος* is not a proper or intelligible description of a person or persons; in translation this is partly concealed by the use of the abstract 'defence', but *ἕρκος* is *prima facie* material, and could not, I think, be otherwise understood without more explanation than is here given.

ἥκω σεβίζων σόν, Κλυταιμήστρα, κράτος·
δίκη γάρ ἐστι φωτὸς ἀρχηγοῦ τίειν
γυναῖκ' ἐρημωθέντος ἄρσενος θρόνου.
σὺ δ' εἴτε κεδνὸν εἴτε μὴ πεπυσμένη
εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν θυηπολεῖς,
κλύοιμ' ἂν εὔφρων· οὐδὲ σιγώσῃ φθόνος.

ΚΛΥΤΑΙΜΗΣΤΡΑ.

εὐάγγελος μέν, ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία,
ἕως γένοιτο μητρὸς εὐφρόνης πάρα.
πεύσει δὲ χάρμα μεῖζον ἐλπίδος κλύειν·
Πριάμου γὰρ ᾑρήκασιν Ἀργεῖοι πόλιν.
ΧΟ. πῶς φής; πέφευγε τοὔπος ἐξ ἀπιστίας.
ΚΛ. Τροίαν Ἀχαιῶν οὖσαν· ἦ τορῶς λέγω;
ΧΟ. χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει δάκρυον ἐκκαλουμένη.
ΚΛ. εὖ γὰρ φρονοῦντος ὄμμα σοῦ κατηγορεῖ.
ΧΟ. τί γὰρ τὸ πιστόν; ἔστι τῶνδέ σοι τέκμαρ;
ΚΛ. ἔστιν, τί δ' οὐχί; μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ.
ΧΟ. πότερα δ' ὀνείρων φάσματ' εὐπιθῆ σέβεις;
ΚΛ. οὐ δόξαν ἂν λάβοιμι βριζούσης φρενός.

273. δ' εἰ τὸ corr. to text. 286. εὐπειθεῖ corr. to εὐπειθῆ.

---

270. **σεβίζων...κράτος** *i.e.* in obedience to her command. Here Clytaemnestra comes forth attended (see *v.* 363).

273—275. *Whether tidings good or not good prompt thee to celebrate this ceremony of hopeful announcement, I would gladly learn; though, if thou wouldst keep the secret, I am content.* **κεδνὸν** literally 'a good thing', cf. *θαυμαστὸν ποιεῖς, ἄτοπον λέγεις*, etc. Kühner *Gk. Gr.* § 403.—With **μὴ** supply *κεδνόν*. The elders, as persons worthy of the queen's confidence, wish to know whether her rejoicing is genuine or a feint. She has implied that she has good news; but as she has not disclosed it, they feel a natural doubt whether in reality she is not merely trying to forestall and discredit a *bad* report which has reached her and may get abroad. This explains the addition **οὐδὲ σιγώσῃ φθόνος.** Only on the supposition that the news was really bad could the queen have any motive for such concealment. The elders, preoccupied with the dangers near home, attribute their fears to the queen; she herself had pretended to share them (see *v.* 874).—**εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν**, dative (Latin ablative) of circumstance, literally 'with fair-announcing hopes', *i.e.* with promising announcement; see *v.* 101 *ἐκ θυσιῶν φαίνουσ' ἐλπίς.*—**εἴ τι** (Auratus) is widely adopted, and perhaps right.—Another possible interpretation is 'But whether thou hast heard some good news, or hast not heard any, but art sacrificing in the *hope* of such' etc. But the mere expectation of news would be no probable motive for the ceremony.

276—278. She corrects their expres-

Enter CLYTAEMNESTRA, Conspirators, *etc.*

I am come, Clytaemnestra, in observance of thy royalty. 'Tis right to render respect to the sovereign and queen, when the husband's throne is empty. Now whether tidings good or not good have moved thee by this ceremony to announce good hope, I would gladly learn from thee: though if thou wouldst keep the secret, I am content.

Clytaemnestra. For 'good', as says the proverb, may the kind morn announce it from her kind mother night. But 'hope' is something short of the joy thou art to hear. The Argive army hath taken Priam's town.

An Elder. How sayest thou? I scarce caught the words, so incredible they were.

Cl. I said that Troy is ours. Do I speak clear?

Eld. 'Tis joy that surprises me and commands a tear.

Cl. Yes, 'tis a loyal gladness of which thine eye accuses thee.

Eld. And what then is the proof? Hast thou evidence for this?

Cl. I have indeed, if miracle deceive me not.

Eld. Is it a dream-sign that commands thine easy credence?

Cl. No fancy would I accept from a brain bemused.

---

sion *εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν*, accepting *εὐάγγελος* with the remark that, according to the proverb, men look for good news in the morning, but rejecting *ἐλπίς*, as her news leaves nothing further to hope.—The proverb plays upon the ambiguity of *εὐφρόνη*, *night* and *kindness* (Hesych. cf. *δυσφρόνη*), signifying 'May Night, according to her *kind* name, send her child Morning with a *kind* message!' (Sidgwick). This *εὐφρόνη* echoes the elder's *εὔφρων*.—**μεῖζον...κλύειν** *importing more than hope*, literally 'greater than hope to the hearing'. It is *μεῖζον ἐλπίδος* also in another sense 'greater than could be imagined', but this sense is only for the queen and the audience.

281. **οὖσαν**: cf. Soph. *El.* 676 *θανόντ' Ὀρέστην νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι λέγω* (Wecklein).

282—3. Emphasis on *χαρά* and on *εὖ*. 'My tear is the tear of *joy*'. 'Yes, it is *loyal gladness* (not disloyal sorrow) of which thine eye accuses thee'.—**κατηγορεῖ**: the misapplication of the word sounds like a kindly jest, but is grim earnest. The loyalty of the elders is their crime, as they are soon to find.

284. This punctuation (Prien, Sidgwick) is demanded by the form of the answer **ἔστιν**.—**τὸ πιστόν** 'what you rely on', *the proof*.

286. **εὐπιθῆ** Blomfield, the correct form according to analogy.—**εὐπιθῆ σέβεις** together, 'pay the respect of an easy credence to': *εὐπιθής* literally 'easily believed'.—**ὀνείρων**, suggested by *μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ*: a false dream would be a 'miraculous deceit'.

287. 'No *fancy* would I accept, no fancy of a mind asleep'. So we may perhaps justify the order of the words; but the reading must not be considered certain.—**λάβοιμι**, *i.e. δεξαίμην*, *sed quaere*:

ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ἦ σ' ἐπίανέν τις ἄπτερος φάτις;
ΚΛ. παιδὸς νέας ὣς κάρτ' ἐμωμήσω φρένας.
ΧΟ. ποίου χρόνου δὲ καὶ πεπόρθηται πόλις;
ΚΛ. τῆς νῦν τεκούσης φῶς τόδ' εὐφρόνης λέγω.
ΧΟ. καὶ τίς τόδ' ἐξίκοιτ' ἂν ἀγγέλων τάχος;
ΚΛ. Ἥφαιστος, Ἴδης λαμπρὸν ἐκπέμπων σέλας·
φρυκτὸς δὲ φρυκτὸν δεῦρ' ἀπ' ἀγγάρου πυρὸς
ἔπεμπεν. Ἴδη μὲν πρὸς Ἑρμαῖον λέπας
Λήμνου· μέγαν δὲ πανὸν ἐκ νήσου τρίτον
Ἀθῷον αἶπος Ζηνὸς ἐξεδέξατο
ὑπερτελής τε (πόντον ὥστε νωτίσαι
ἰσχὺς πορευτοῦ λαμπάδος πρὸς ἡδονήν)
πεύκη, τὸ χρυσοφεγγὲς ὥς τις ἥλιος

294. ἀγγέλου. 296. φανὸν.

λάκοιμι Karsten (not satisfactory).—On the note here cancelled (ed. 1) see *Cho.* 532 and note there.

288. **ἐπίανεν** *has cheered* or *encouraged thee*, from ἐπ-ιαίνω, where ἐπι- has the same force (*up to* a certain point) as in ἐπαίρω, and ἰαίνω its usual meaning (see L. and Sc. *s.v.* ἰαίνω).—This aorist is commonly referred to πιαίνω *to fatten*, taken in the sense of *puffing up*, but see Toup on Hesychius, cited by Blomfield *ad loc.* The use of πιαίνω and connected words does not support the supposed metaphor. See further Appendix F.—**ἄπτερος φάτις**. The context shows that this was some superstitious proof yet lower in the scale than a dream, probably something like 'a vague presentiment' (Paley, Kennedy). The meaning and origin of the phrase are unknown. It may or may not be derived from πτερόν (either in the sense of *wing* or of *omen*), or connected with the Homeric τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος, which in its turn is doubtful.—'A report not winged' like the dream-god, *i.e.* brought without any dream (Wecklein).—'An unspoken rumour', cf. ἄπτερος μῦθος *word unspoken* (Sidgwick).

290. **ποίου χρόνου** literally '*within what time* lies the capture of the city?' *i.e.* how far back is it to be put?—**ποίου** as compared with πόσου or τίνος (*what sort of time*) gives the question the air of incredulous wonder. Compare the common use of ποῖος in contempt (L. and Sc. *s.v.*).—**καί**, emphasizing, assumes the fact, 'Since it *is* taken, since when *is* it?'

291. She points to the dawn just breaking.

294. **ἀγγάρου** Canter (Αἰσχύλος γοῦν ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι τὸν ἐκ διαδοχῆς πυρσὸν 'ἀπ' ἀγγάρου πυρός' ἔφη *Et. M.* p. 7), a Persian word describing the couriers who transmitted orders by successive stages. Herodotus (8. 98) like Aeschylus compares it to the Greek λαμπαδηφορία (*v.* 324).—On the story which follows see the Introduction § 1.

296. **πανὸν** Casaubon. πρότερος δὲ τούτων Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι μέμνηται τοῦ πανοῦ, Athen. xv. p. 700 E.—**φανὸν** is also good and classical; probably both are very ancient readings in this passage.

296—300. The subject of ἐξεδέξατο is the whole phrase Ἀθῷον...πεύκη, 'Athos *and* its beacon' (a 'hendiadys'). *Note carefully that the conjunction is* τε *not* δέ.

Elders are shocked by the fall of Troy.

Eld. Yet canst thou have taken cheer from a voice that bore no sign?

Cl. Thou holdest my sense as low as it were a babe's.

Eld. And what like time is it since the city fell?

Cl. It fell, I say, in the night whence yonder light is this moment born.

Eld. But what messenger could arrive so quick?

Cl. The fire-god was the messenger. From Ida he sped forth the bright blaze, which beacon after beacon by courier flame passed on to us. Ida sent it first to Hermes' rock in Lemnos; and to the great bonfire on Lemnos' isle succeeded third Zeus' mountain of Athos, with such a soaring pile of wood upon it as might strengthen the travelling torch to pass joyously over the wide main; and this, with the golden light as it were

---

The periods of this narration are joined throughout by δέ. Here τε couples not periods but words.—**ὑπερτελής** *rising above all*.—**πόντον...ἡδονήν.** This explains and gives the ground for ὑπερτελής. Clytaemnestra, vaguely aware that in this leap of the Aegaean she must be making a strong demand upon the faith of her hearers, enforces her statement with an explanation as to the size and height of this particular beacon.—**πόντον** properly 'the open sea' with emphasis.—**ἰσχύς,** in apposition to πεύκη, 'strength to the flame' for 'strengthening the flame'; cf. *Theb.* 256 ὀλολυγμόν, θάρσος φίλοις 'the cry which encourages friends', *Ag.* 566 δρόσοι, σίνος ἐσθημάτων 'water, mischievous to garments' etc.—**πορευτοῦ... πρὸς ἡδονήν** 'travelling unreluctantly' (οὐ πρὸς βίαν), not fearing the distance, as it were. This is in effect a predicate; the flame 'travelled gladly' because 'strengthened'.—**πεύκη**: usually a 'torch' of pine-wood, but here extended, like λαμπάς etc., to a 'bonfire' of the same.—See also next note.

300—301. *Which, with the golden light as it were of a sun, blazed on the message to the outlook on Makistos.* **τὸ χρυσοφεγγὲς...ἥλιος** literally 'as a sun its golden light', the verb (*sends*) being supplied from παραγγείλασα. This is better than to join τὸ χρυσοφεγγὲς with σέλας, as accounting better for the article τό.—**σκοπάς.** Commonly this accusative of place is found only with verbs of 'motion to', and not with verbs such as παραγγέλλω: and for this reason some read σκοπαῖς. But considering the metaphorical language of this passage, which represents the beacons throughout as a series of *couriers*, actually travelling with the message from post to post (so πορευτοῦ in this very sentence), the accusative seems intelligible and even advantageous: παραγγέλλω here means not 'to give a message' but 'to go with a message' and therefore takes the construction of a verb of motion.—**παραγγείλασα.** The tense is parallel to that of ἐξεδέξατο, and continues the story.

Recent editions treat this passage as corrupt, on the ground that ὑπερτελής τε...σκοπάς, being a fresh clause with a fresh subject, requires a fresh verb. On this view, which is of long standing, Hermann remarked: 'Nam δέ si legeretur, requireretur verbum pro nomine πεύκη...Nunc vero, τε posito, ἐξεδέξατο etiam ad sequentia refertur'. The text expresses the meaning better than divided clauses would do. The high mountain *and* the vast beacon are coupled, as jointly accomplishing the prodigious task.

σέλας παραγγείλασα Μακίστου σκοπάς·
ὃ δ' οὔτι μέλλων οὐδ' ἀφρασμόνως ὕπνῳ
νικώμενος παρῆκεν ἀγγέλου μέρος·
ἑκὰς δὲ φρυκτοῦ φῶς ἐπ' Εὐρίπου ῥοὰς
Μεσσαπίου φύλαξι σημαίνει μολόν.
οἱ δ' ἀντέλαμψαν καὶ παρήγγειλαν πρόσω
γραίας ἐρείκης θωμὸν ἅψαντες πυρί.
σθένουσα λαμπὰς δ' οὐδέπω μαυρουμένη,
ὑπερθοροῦσα πεδίον...ωποῦ, δίκην
φαιδρᾶς σελήνης, πρὸς Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας,
ἤγειρεν ἄλλην ἐκδοχὴν πομποῦ πυρός.
φάος δὲ τηλέπομπον οὐκ ἠναίνετο
φρουρά, πλέον καίουσα τῶν εἰρημένων·
λίμνην δ' ὑπὲρ Γοργῶπιν ἔσκηψεν φάος
ὄρος τ' ἐπ' Αἰγίπλαγκτον ἐξικνούμενον
ὤτρυνε θεσμὸν μὴ χαρίζεσθαι πυρός.
πέμπουσι δ' ἀνδαίοντες ἀφθόνῳ μένει
φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα, καὶ Σαρωνικοῦ

309. *παιδίον ὠποῦ.*

---

301. **Μακίστου·** *ὄρος Εὐβοίας* schol. Mr Sidgwick says 'in *southern* Euboea', Wecklein 'probably in the north' (as the nearer part to Athos). The question is of little moment; but the mountain by its name would seem to have been 'the highest', or so supposed, in the island; the highest part is about the centre, near Chalcis.

302. **ὁ δέ**: Makistos, *i.e.*, in the literalness of prose, the watchers thereon.—Here the story becomes comparatively reasonable. Of the country between Argos and Aulis Clytaemnestra and the elders might naturally be supposed to have some knowledge. The distances are indeed, as the queen says, full long (*ἑκάς ...πρόσω*), running up to about 25 miles; in a real system other stages would probably have been interpolated for safety; but her conception is conceivable.

303. **παρῆκεν** *neglected.*—The rendering 'sent on' (Paley) lacks authority.

305. **Μεσσαπίου**: in N. Boeotia.

308. **σθένουσα** *taking strength* afresh from the fuel of Messapios; cf. *ἰσχύς* in *v.* 299.

309. **πεδίον......ωποῦ.** The defective word may be read either 'Ωρωποῦ, as by Turnebus, or 'Ασωποῦ, as by the writers of the later MSS. The first reading has the technical advantage of accounting better for the loss of the letters by similarity of syllables. On the other hand the later MSS. may represent a tradition. The 'plain of the river Asopus' is the better description, having regard to the geography. But on the other hand 'the plain of Oropus', properly the maritime part of the plain of the Asopus;

of a sun, blazed on the message to the outlook on Makistos. Nor he for any delay, or for overcoming sleep, neglected heedlessly his messenger-part. Far over Euripus' stream came his beacon-light and gave the sign to the watchers of Messapios. These raised an answering light to pass the signal far away, with pile of withered heath which they kindled up. And the torch thus strengthened flagged not yet, but leaping, broad as a moon, over Asopus' plain to Cithaeron's scar, roused in turn the next herald of the fiery train; nor there did the sentinels refuse the far-heralded light, but made a bonfire higher than was bid, whose flying brightness lit beyond Gorgopis' water, and reaching the mount of Aegiplanctus, eagerly bade him not to slack the commanded fire. They sped it on, throwing high with force unstinted a flame like a great beard, which could even overpass,

---

was claimed and generally possessed by Athens, so that to name the whole from Oropus would have a popular sound to Athenian ears.

313. **φρουρά**: the watchers on Cithaeron.—**πλέον καίουσα τῶν εἰρημένων** 'making a fire larger than was enjoined' (Weil), literally 'more than what was bidden them (*τὰ εἰρημένα*)'. These words confirm and extend the phrase of the previous line *οὐκ ἠναίνετο*, 'denied not' or 'disowned not'. In their enthusiasm the watchmen of Cithaeron, so far from showing reluctance, actually exceeded their instructions. See further Appendix G.

314. **Γοργῶπιν**: apparently a bay or estuary in the territory of Megara, N. E. of the Corinthian gulf.—*λίμνην φασὶν εἶναι ἐν* Κορίνθῳ, Hesychius; but the description must be very inaccurate, if it refers to the *λίμνη* here mentioned.

315. **Αἰγίπλαγκτον**: obviously part of Geranea in the Megarid. *ὄρος Μεγαρίδος* schol.

316. *Urged him to exact strictly the commanded fire.* The fire from Cithaeron strives to rouse an enthusiasm like its own in others less ready. The receiving mountain is personified, like **Μάκιστος** in *v.* 301, but with a difference of character.—**θεσμὸν μὴ χαρίζεσθαι πυρός** literally 'not to remit (to himself or his watch) the commandment of fire'. The use of *χαρίζεσθαι* here is generally condemned, and is difficult, though perhaps defensible. The sense and common constructions of the verb are closely similar to those of *προίεσθαι*, and of such Latin verbs as *indulgere*, *remittere*, *condonare*, etc. We have on the one hand *χαρίζεσθαί τί τινι* 'to give up, surrender, sacrifice', and on the other hand *χαρίζεσθαί τινι* 'to be indulgent to, not strict with', as in *χαρίζεσθαι ἵππῳ indulgere equo.* From these it is not far to such a phrase as *χαρίζεσθαι θεσμὸν remittere imperium* 'to let an order be neglected', and we are scarcely entitled to reject the extension when it occurs.—*μὴ χρονίζεσθαι* Paley (making *θεσμὸν* the object of *ὤτρυνε*), *μηχανήσασθαι* Margoliouth: *μὴ χατίζεσθαι* Heath, 'not to be wanting', assumes a doubtful word. See further Wecklein, Appendix.

318—322. **κατόπτην** W. Headlam; *κατοπτὸν* Canter. The genitive is governed by the preposition.—The 'headland' should be 'the high coast on the S. side of the bay of Cenchrea' (Wecklein).—**καὶ...ὑπερβάλλειν**, *i.e.* *ὥστε αὐτὴν καὶ ὑπερβάλλειν*, a consecutive infinitive depending on the whole previous sentence,

πορθμοῦ κατόπτην πρῶν᾽ ὑπερβάλλειν πρόσω
φλέγουσαν· εἶτ᾽ ἔσκηψεν, εἶτ᾽ ἀφίκετο
᾽Αραχναῖον αἶπος, ἀστυγείτονας σκοπάς·
κἄπειτ᾽ ᾽Ατρειδῶν ἐς τό γε σκήπτει στέγος
φάος τόδ᾽ οὐκ ἄπαππον ᾽Ιδαίου πυρός.
τοιοίδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι
ἄλλος παρ᾽ ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι·
νικᾷ δ᾽ ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.
τέκμαρ τοιοῦτον σύμβολόν τέ σοι λέγω
ἀνδρὸς παραγγείλαντος ἐκ Τροίας ἐμοί.

ΧΟ. θεοῖς μὲν αὖθις, ὦ γύναι, προσεύξομαι·
λόγους δ᾽ ἀκοῦσαι τούσδε κἀποθαυμάσαι
διηνεκῶς θέλοιμ᾽ ἄν, ὡς λέγοις, πάλιν.

ΚΛ. Τροίαν ᾽Αχαιοὶ τῇδ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ.

319. *κάτοπτρον.* 323—1050. Readings of f. 324. *τοιοίδ᾽ ἔτυμοι.*

---

and specially upon *μέγαν*.—**φλέγουσαν** feminine, not masculine, because *φλογός* is the really substantive word, *μέγαν πώγωνα* being merely descriptive and adjectival, and therefore *αὐτήν*, not *αὐτόν*, is the pronoun supplied (Paley, Sidgwick).—**εἶτ᾽ ἔσκηψεν, εἶτ᾽ ἀφίκετο.** In a sentence of symmetrical and prosaic form these clauses would be parallel with the infinitive, as thus, *ὥστε πρῶνα μὲν ὑπερβάλλειν, εἶτα δὲ σκῆψαι καὶ ἀφικέσθαι κτλ.* (The point made is that the courier-fire, eager to finish the long journey, 'ran in home' as it were, and would not after Aegiplanctus make an unnecessary stop.) But the second parallel clause is turned for variety into an independent sentence, and the effect is further strengthened by the omission of *μέν...δέ*, and by the rhetorical repetition of *εἶτα* in place of the simple copula *καί*.—**ἔπειτα** in *v.* 322 points back to *εἶτα* in *v.* 320, 'then... after then': they mark as it were the last stage and the very last.—**τό γε** *i.e. τοῦτό γε*: *τό* demonstrative, several times used by Aeschylus. The particle **γε** (literally 'to the roof of the Atridae this at least') gives to the close the animation of poetic feeling. This time *at least*, after being often sent on, the far-travelled messenger had indeed arrived.—*τόδε* recc.—*ἔστ᾽ ἔσκηψεν, εὖτ᾽ ἀφίκετο* 'till it lighted, when it arrived' Hermann. The repetitions *φλογὸς...φλέγουσαν, εἶτ᾽ ἔσκηψεν... ἔπειτα σκήπτει* are not negligent but calculated.

323. *The light there, which shows a pedigree from the beacon upon Ida.* **φάος τόδε**: she points to Arachnaeus, behind which, to add effect to her words, the elders might now see the beginning of day. It is the place of the beacon which helps to suggest the comparison of it, on its first appearance, to the dawn, *v.* 22.—**οὐκ...πυρός** literally 'not without an ancestor in the beacon of Ida'. The genitive depends on the privative force of the adjective.—The negative turn of this jesting phrase is for the ears of the audience. As a fact, the beacon was *ἄπαππον*, and had no 'ancestry' at all, but it has supplied the defect, as others

so far it flamed, the headland that looks down upon the Saronic gulf, alighting then, and only then, when it reached the outlook, nigh to our city, upon the Arachnaean peak; whence next it lighted (at last!) here upon our royal roof, yon light, which shows a pedigree from the fire of Ida. Such are the torch-bearers which I have ordained, by succession one to another completing the course:—of whom the victor is he who ran first and last. Such is the evidence and token I give thee, my husband's message sped out of Troy to me.

Eld. My thanksgiving, lady, to heaven shall be presently paid; but first this story—I would fain satisfy my wonder by hearing it repeated, in thy way of telling, from point to point.

Cl. Troy is this day in the hands of the Achaeans! Me-

---

will do, by a little invention, ἔφυσε πάππους in the phrase of Aristophanes (*Birds* 765), and so is ἄπαππον no longer.

324. **τοιοίδε τοί μοι** Schütz. **τοιοίδ' ἕτοιμοι** a.—**λαμπαδηφόρων**. In the race called λαμπαδηφορία a chain of runners, posted at intervals, passed a lighted torch from the start to the goal. The chain won which accomplished this in the shortest time, provided that the torch was kept alight. (There were several forms of the race, but this is the method meant here.) The custom was specially popular at Athens.—**ἄλλος...πληρούμενοι.** The expression is not clear, since grammar suggests ἄλλος νόμος, while sense requires ἄλλος λαμπαδηφόρος (F. B. Jevons *Class. Rev.* VI. 327, proposing ἄλλου for ἄλλος). But it is not incorrect, since **ἄλλος** (λαμπαδ.) **παρ' ἄλλου** may stand in apposition to λαμπ. νόμοι, and seems practically intelligible. The two genitives ἄλλου...ἄλλου, though grammatically right, do not come well to the ear.

326. See Appendix H.

329—331. The elders are so astonished that they scarcely know what to think or say, and one of them tries to draw from the queen some 'more details' (Sidgwick) on the subject of the beacons, putting the request delicately in the form of a compliment to her narration. Naturally he does not succeed. The thoughts of the queen are gone away to the absent ones 'in Troy'!—**θεοῖς...προσεύξομαι**: this is to guard, so far as may be, against the appearance of disbelief. He will act upon the queen's testimony presently, when he has heard it again.—**αὖθις** *later*, *afterwards*.—**ἀποθαυμάσαι** *to admire fully*.—**διηνεκῶς**: both 'clearly' and 'continuously', without anything omitted.—**ὡς λέγοις** *as you would tell it*. The mood of λέγοις follows that of θέλοιμ' ἂν on the same principle which determines ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν κλύοις (*v.* 264), the whole action lying in the same hypothetical time. Sidgwick compares Plato *Men.* 92 C πῶς ἂν εἰδείης περὶ τούτου οὗ ἄπειρος εἴης; 'how could you know that of which (*ex hypothesi*) you have no experience?'—ὡς λέγεις a, εἰ λέγοις Blomfield, οὓς λέγεις Bothe.

332. On the significance of this speech see the Introduction. The scene at this point, the contrasted attitudes of the two parties (see on *v.* 363), and the painful interest with which, for different reasons, they all mark the words and behaviour of the queen, make an effective moment.

οἶμαι βοὴν ἄμικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν.
ὄξος τ᾽ ἄλειφά τ᾽ ἐκχέας ταὐτῷ κύτει
διχοστατοῦντ᾽ ἂν οὐ φίλως προσεννέποις·
καὶ τῶν ἁλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων δίχα
φθογγὰς ἀκούειν ἔστι συμφορᾶς διπλῆς.
οἳ μὲν γὰρ ἀμφὶ σώμασιν πεπτωκότες
ἀνδρῶν κασιγνήτων τε καὶ φυταλμίων,
παῖδες γερόντων, οὐκέτ᾽ ἐξ ἐλευθέρου
δέρης ἀποιμώζουσι φιλτάτων μόρον·
τοὺς δ᾽ αὖτε νυκτίπλαγκτος ἐκ μάχης πόνος
νῆστις πρὸς ἀρίστοισιν ὧν ἔχει πόλις
τάσσει, πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐν μέρει τεκμήριον,
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἕκαστος ἔσπασεν τύχης πάλον
ἐν αἰχμαλώτοις Τρωικοῖς οἰκήμασιν
ναίουσιν ἤδη, τῶν ὑπαιθρίων πάγων
δρόσων τ᾽ ἀπαλλαγέντες ὡς δυσδαίμονες·
ἀφύλακτον εὑδήσουσι πᾶσαν εὐφρόνην.

---

333. **ἄμικτον** *that will not blend.*

334—336. **ὄξος τε...καὶ τῶν ἁλόντων**: either τε and καί here answer to each other ('as...so'), or τε...τε. The first is preferable.

334. **ἐκχέας ταὐτῷ κύτει** *shouldst thou pour out oil and vinegar with the same vessel, i.e.* put them into the same vase or bottle and pour them from it together. The dative is instrumental.—It is not clear that this should be changed (Canter and others) to **ἐγχέας**. The repulsion of the two ingredients would be more conspicuous in the pouring out of a mixture (as upon a plate) than in the pouring in.

335. *Thou wouldst exclaim at their unfriendly parting,* literally 'wouldst accost them as (persons) parting not like friends', an expression of studied irony for a violent mutual repulsion.—The use of *προσεννέπειν* (*to name, apostrophize*) *διχοστατοῦντε* is natural in a language which used the participial apostrophe (*e.g.* Eur. *Tro.* 1168 *ὦ μείζον᾽ ὄγκον δορὸς ἔχοντες ἢ φρενῶν*).—The expression *διχοστατεῖν οὐ φίλως* suggests perhaps that *διχοστατεῖν φίλως* would have a meaning. In *Theb.* 918 (where see note) we have the term *διατομαὶ φίλαι* (and *οὐ φίλαι*) for a partition, friendly or unfriendly, between joint occupiers of land. Possibly a similar metaphor lies behind the language here, and *διχοστατεῖν φίλως* meant a 'friendly dissolution', as of partnership or marriage.—*οὐ φίλω* (Auratus and others).

336. **τῶν ἁλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων**: not here exactly equivalent to *τῶν ἁλόντων καὶ τῶν κρατησάντων*. The comparison is between the *compound* of oil and vinegar (which will not blend) and the *ensemble* of victors and vanquished.—**δίχα** with *ἀκούειν*: 'distinctly', 'separately'.

338. **οἱ μέν**: the living captives would be chiefly or solely (particularly in the case of Troy) women and girls; but the generic description of them as the vanquished party (*οἱ ἁλόντες*) is nevertheless naturally not feminine.

339. *Husbands, brothers, fathers and*

thinks there must be sound there of voices that will not blend. Pour with the same vessel vinegar and oil, and thou wilt exclaim at their unfriendly parting. Even so their tones, the conqueror and the conquered, fall different as their fortunes upon the ear. These on the ground clasping the dead, their husbands, brothers, fathers, sons, young children weeping for gray sires, themselves enslaved, are wailing for their beloved. Those the hungry weariness of fighting and a restless night hath set to break their fast upon what is in the town, not billeted orderly, but lodging themselves forthwith, by such chance as falls to each eager hand, in the captured houses of Troy, to escape as they may the miseries of the open air, the frosts and the dews. With no watch to keep they will sleep the whole night long.

---

sons. The gender of *ἀνήρ* is to be extended throughout. **φυταλμίων** is here a substantive. The word means properly 'connected with geniture'; so in Soph. *O. C.* 150 *ἀλαῶν ὀμμάτων ἆρα καὶ ἦσθα φυτάλμιος; wast thou sightless even from birth?* Here it means 'relations by geniture' (*i.e.* parents, children, etc.). So **κασιγνήτων** is properly 'collaterals', brothers, cousins, etc.

340. **παῖδες γερόντων** *children bewailing aged*; not that *all* the captives were children, or *all* the slain aged. The phrase signalizes the most pathetic figures, among the captives the orphan children, among the slain those whose years might have saved them, but did not, from the indiscriminate massacre.—Another punctuation joins *φυταλμίων παῖδες γερόντων* (or *φυτάλμιοι παίδων γέροντες* Weil). A better correction is that of Karsten *παίδων γερόντων both young and old, i.e.* of all ages.

341. **δέρης**, both *neck* and *throat* (Eur. *Or.* 41 *οὔτε σῖτα διὰ δέρης ἐδέξατο* Wecklein), here combines the two meanings. With *οὐκέτ' ἐλευθέρου* it is *neck*, the metaphor being that of the yoke, with *ἀποιμώζουσι throat*. No English word will exactly fit.—**ἀποιμώζουσι**: not *bewail loudly* (L. and Sc.), but *bewail away, i.e.* 'bewail desperately, as lost'. Cf. Antiphon 134. 15 *ἀπῴμωξεν ἐμέ τε καὶ αὑτὸν ὡς ἀπολλυμένους*, and Aeschyl. *fr.* 128 *'Αντίλοχ' ἀποίμωξόν με τοῦ τεθνηκότος τὸν ζῶντα μᾶλλον*.

343. **νῆστις** *hungry toil, i.e.* 'making hungry'.—**νήστεις** (many texts) is strongly favoured by the grouping of the words. But is it clear that Aeschylus would have used the form *νήστεις* and not rather *νήστιδας* or *νήστιας*?—**ὧν ἔχει πόλις**. The besiegers are starving (see *v.* 132), and the long-beleaguered city offers but little.

344. *Not in order according to billet.* The casual banquet of the famished plunderers, establishing themselves in the first house where they find food, is contrasted with the orderliness of a well-appointed army distributed to quarters by 'token' or 'billet'.

345—347. *Rather by such chance as falls to each eager hand they are installing themselves forthwith in the captured houses of Troy.* **ὡς ἕκαστος...πάλον** literally 'as each has snatched a lot' *i.e.* according to the fortune of each plunderer.—**αἰχμαλώτοις**: the epithet, like *ὧν ἔχει πόλις*, denotes the misery of the comforts to which the victors fly. The houses are such as they would be when carried after a desperate night of fire and sword. It will be remembered that in the time of Aeschylus the private buildings of the Greeks, even in great cities, were poor and slight in construction.

347—349. *Glad of such poor deliverance*

εἰ δ' εὖ σέβουσι τοὺς πολισσούχους θεοὺς
τοὺς τῆς ἁλούσης γῆς θεῶν θ' ἱδρύματα,
οὐ κἂν ἑλόντες αὖθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν.
ἔρως δὲ μή τις πρότερον ἐμπίπτῃ στρατῷ
πορθεῖν τὰ μὴ χρὴ κέρδεσιν νικωμένους·
δεῖ γὰρ πρὸς οἴκους νοστίμου σωτηρίας,
κάμψαι διαύλου θάτερον κῶλον πάλιν.
θεοῖς δ' ἀναμπλάκητος εἰ μόλοι στρατός,
ἐγρήγορον† τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὀλωλότων.
γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ πρόσπαια μὴ τύχοι, κακά.
τοιαῦτά τοι γυναικὸς ἐξ ἐμοῦ κλύοις

350. *εὐσεβοῦσι.* 352. *οὐκ ἂν γ'. αὖ θάνοιεν.* 354. **ἃ.**

---

from the frosts and dews of the open air. With no watch to keep they will sleep the whole night long. **ἀπαλλαγέντες ὡς δυσδαίμονες**, literally 'ridding themselves as poor wretches may', where *ὡς* has the same qualifying sense as in *ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιος* 'a good man for a Lacedaemonian' and the like.—**τῶν ὑπαιθρίων** neuter, gen. of *τὰ ὑπαίθρια*, to which *πάγων δρόσων τε* stands in apposition, 'the conditions of the open air, frost and dew'; cf. *τῶν ποικίλων v.* 917 : the article is therefore necessary.—**ἀφύλακτον**...... **εὐφρόνην** 'a night being watchless, they will sleep it all'. **ἀφύλακτον** is a predicate and equivalent to *ἀφύλακτον οὖσαν*. This explains further the meaning of *ὡς δυσδαίμονες*: after the exposure of the camp and the weariness of the watch the soldiers are not nice enough to disdain the wrecked houses. The mere security will give them an unbroken night.—*ὄντες πρότερον δηλονότι δυστυχεῖς νῦν ἀμερίμνως εὐδήσουσι* (schol. on *v.* 348) assumes the punctuation *ἀπαλλαγέντες, ὡς...εὐφρόνην* which is that of the MSS., but apparently lacks a conjunction.—*ὡς δ' εὐδαίμονες* Stanley, gives the same sense in another way.—**ἀπαλλαχθέντες** a, perhaps rightly.

350. **εὖ σέβουσι** Scaliger and Porson, **εὐσεβοῦσι** MSS. The first accentuation is the safer, as the evidence for the transitive *εὐσεβεῖν* is not conclusive.—**εἰ...σέβουσι**, not *ἢν σέβωσι*. The English *if they observe*, standing for both, easily misleads. The captors are doing as they should, or otherwise, while Clytaemnestra speaks (according to her pretended assumption).

352. **οὐ κἄν.** The emphasizing *καί*, if correct, belongs to *ἑλόντες* (*even* after conquest), 'they will escape a ruinous ending of their victory after all'.—**οὐ τἂν** Hermann.—*οὐκ ἀνελόντες* a, *οὐκ ἂν γ' ἑλόντες* f h (a correction).—**ἀνθαλοῖεν** Auratus. *ἀνθάνοιεν* a.

353. **ἔρως μή τις...ἐμπίπτῃ** *the desire, it is to be feared, may come upon them.* On *μὴ* with the *present* subjunctive, as a principal sentence, expressing an anticipation or suspicion about the future, see on *Theb.* 183.—An imperative sense is not admissible with this tense.—The sin of the victors in this respect (*v.* 532) is doubly connected with the sequel; it was punished by the disaster of the fleet, and it led to the capture of Cassandra, who was torn from sanctuary.

354. **τὰ μὴ χρὴ** a, *ἃ μὴ χρὴ* f. For the relative *τὰ* cf. *v.* 531 *Διὸς μακέλλῃ, τῇ κατείργασται πέδον.* The substitution of the familiar *ἃ* is of no significance.

355. The genitive *σωτηρίας* and the infinitive *κάμψαι* both depend upon *δεῖ*, the infinitive clause translating the literal

Now must they pay due respect to the gods that inhabit the town, the gods of the conquered land, or their victory may end in their own destruction after all. Too soon belike for their safety, the soldiery, seized with greed, may yield to their covetousness and lay hands on forbidden spoil. They have still to bring themselves home, have still the backward arm of the double course to make. And if no sin against heaven rest on the returning host, there is the wrong of the dead that watches. Evil may find accomplishment, although it fall not at once.

But for all these my womanish words, may the good prevail,

σωτηρίας πρὸς οἴκους into a popular metaphor from the *diaulos* or double race-course.—**κάμψαι...κῶλον**: as we might say 'to make the second half of your round' or 'lap'. *κάμψαι* is transitive.

357—358. 'And if the army return without offence against *the gods*, the wrong of *the dead* is on the watch'. There is an antithesis between the words placed first and last. The primary meaning is this: the ruin of Troy and the slaughter of her population naturally cry for vengeance and expose the victors, according to the doctrine of Nemesis, to especial danger at this time. They have therefore little need to increase this danger, which is already 'watching its opportunity', by plundering the sanctuaries and thus incurring the avoidable anger of the gods. For the queen herself, who proposes to avenge her daughter, and for the conspirators, infuriated by the sacrifice of lives in the war, 'the wrong of the dead' has another meaning. —The apodosis to *εἰ μόλοι*, 'they may suffer the vengeance of the dead', is not expressly stated in the following clause but implied.—**ἐγρήγορον**. The misformed adjective *ἐγρήγορος* (whence the late verb *ἐγρηγορέω*) can scarcely be as old as Aeschylus. Either **ἐγρηγορὸς** (Porson) or **ἐγρήγορεν** should probably be read; if the first, we still supply *ἐστί*.—For the metaphor cf. Eur. *El.* 41 *εὕδοντ' ἂν ἐξήγειρε τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος φόνον* (Paley), for the use of *πῆμα* Soph. *El.* 258 *πατρῷα πήματα* 'my father's wrongs'.

359. *Evil may find accomplishment, if it fall not at once, i.e.* 'postponed is not prevented', 'the victors will be in danger for some time yet'.—**γένοιτ' ἂν** 'may be accomplished', cf. *v.* 264 *ἐπεὶ γένοιτο* 'when it is accomplished'.—**πρόσπαια** 'sudden, off-hand', a secondary predicate.—In this and the preceding clause *εἰ* is *concessive* and equivalent to the more exact *καὶ εἰ* of common use (see Kühner *Greek Grammar* § 578, note 2).

For further discussion of *vv.* 357—359 see Appendix I.

360—361. Conscious of the thoughts covered by this pretence of solicitude for the absent, she breaks off and dismisses it with a light self-reproach. It will prove, she trusts, no more than the nervousness of a woman.—**κλύοις**. *κλύεις* a (as in *v.* 331 *λέγεις* for *λέγοις*), to get a construction simpler in appearance. But the optative is right. The mistake arises from stopping off *v.* 360 as a separate sentence. It is related as a concessive clause to *v.* 361 and would in common parlance require *μέν*, thus: *τοιαῦτα μὲν κλύοις τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη, i.e.* literally 'I pray that thou mayst hear such words and yet the good triumph', or in English form 'I pray that, though thou hearest such words, the good may triumph'. The propriety of the optative may be made more clear, according to English conceptions, by paraphrasing the second clause; *οὕτω τὰ τοιαῦτα κλύοις ὥστε κρατεῖν τὸ εὖ*. A precise parallel is *αἴλινον εἰπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω* (*Anglice*

τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν·
πολλῶν γὰρ ἐσθλῶν τὴν ὄνησιν εἱλόμην.
ΧΟ. β'. γύναι, κατ' ἄνδρα σώφρον' εὐφρόνως λέγεις.
ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας πιστά σου τεκμήρια
θεοὺς προσειπεῖν εὖ παρασκευάζομαι·
χάρις γὰρ οὐκ ἄτιμος εἴργασται πόνων.

ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ καὶ νὺξ φιλία,
μεγάλων κόσμων κτεάτειρα,
ἥτ' ἐπὶ Τροίας πύργοις ἔβαλες
στεγανὸν δίκτυον, ὡς μήτε μέγαν
μήτ' οὖν νεαρῶν τιν' ὑπερτελέσαι
μέγα δουλείας
γάγγαμον ἄτης παναλώτου.
Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι
τὸν τάδε πράξαντ' ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ
τείνοντα πάλαι τόξον, ὅπως ἂν
μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄστρων
βέλος ἠλίθιον σκήψειεν.
ΧΟ. Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσ' ἀνειπεῖν· στρ. α'.

379. ἔχουσαν (corr. to ἔχουσ') εἰπεῖν.

'though the dirge must be uttered, let the good win').

362. *For this choice gives me the enjoyment of more blessings than one.* 'Den Genuss von vielen Guten erwähle ich mir damit' (Wecklein, reading τήνδε). The construction is εἱλόμην τὴν (*i.e.* ταύτην τὴν ὄνησιν) ὄνησιν (οὖσαν) πολλῶν ἐσθλῶν. The demonstrative follows the gender of the predicate ὄνησιν. Ostensibly this phrase means no more than that τὸ εὖ covers everything desirable: to Clytaemnestra it means that more senses than one can be put upon τὸ εὖ.—**εἱλόμην**: the aorist refers to the moment before, and to the preceding wish.—τήνδ' Hermann; but the archaic demonstrative is defensible.—Another possible rendering is 'I prefer that my enjoyment should be an enjoyment of *many* blessings (not few)', *i.e.* 'of what is good one would have as much as may be'. The remark will then refer specially to μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν. The victory is a sure ἐσθλόν: if *all* turns out well, so much the better. Yet other renderings may be suggested; but the first interpretation is prevalent and seems the best.

363. ΧΟΡΟΣ β'. On the question who are the speakers here, and how the following scene is to be conceived, see Appendix J.

365. **προσειπεῖν εὖ** *to praise.*

366. *For there hath been wrought* (by the gods) *a return in full for our pains.* **οὐκ ἄτιμος** 'not inadequate' (Paley), literally 'not without the value' of the trouble spent.—**πόνων** depends directly

plainly, I say, and undoubtfully; for choosing so, I choose more blessings than one.

A Conspirator. Lady, no man could speak more kindly wisdom than thou. For my part, after the sure proof heard from thee, my purpose is now to give our thanks to the gods, who have wrought a return in full for all the pains.

[*Exit Clytaemnestra.*

Conspirators. Hail, sovereign Zeus, hail, gracious night; high is the glory thou hast won, thou night, that hast cast over the towers of Troy meshes so close, that none full-grown, nay, nor any young could pass the wide enslaving net, one capture taking them all. Zeus, god of host and guest, I confess him great, who hath wrought this vengeance, with aim upon the ravisher taken long, that so neither heaven-high the bolt might idly go, nor short of the mark might fall.

Elders. Zeus' stroke it is which they dare proclaim. This

---

upon *χάρις*, though relative in sense to *ἄτιμος*.

367—378. Clytaemnestra retires. During this anapaestic march, sung by the sub-chorus, the principal chorus of elders are moving into their position for the following hymn.—**νὺξ φιλία.** All this passage takes a poignant irony from the fact that it is really Argos and the elders, not Troy and her people, who are enslaved by the work of this 'gracious night'.

370. **στεγανὸν...ὡς** *i.e.* *ὥστε*, *so close that* etc.—**μέγαν** *full-grown.*

371. **μήτ' οὖν** 'nor *if it comes to that*': this is the full force of the expression, but we have no English equivalent that is not cumbrous.—**μήτ' οὖν...τινά.** Here the irony of the situation turns against the singers. The conspiracy which enthrones Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus is the work of the younger generation (*νεαροί*, see the Introduction). Their own language here might remind them that tyrants are seldom grateful, and that those who set up cannot always pull down.

373. **ἄτης παναλώτου** genitive 'of equivalent' or 'of quality' depending upon the whole phrase *μέγα δ. γάγγαμον* (not in apposition to *δουλείας*).

374. **μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι**: the adj. is a predicate, 'I bow before his greatness'.

375. **ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ** with *τείνοντα* (with *πράξαντα* ed. 1, but wrongly). On the name see *vv.* 60, 714.

376. **ὅπως ἂν...σκήψειεν**: practically here final, and not distinguishable from *ὅπως σκήψειεν*. For the history of these constructions (in which, however, many points are open to dispute) see Kühner *Greek Grammar* §§ 552—553.

377. **πρὸ καιροῦ** *before* (*i.e.* short of) *the mark*: cf. *v.* 778. **ὑπὲρ ἄστρων** hyperbole for 'too high'.—This is the usual interpretation of *πρὸ καιροῦ*. Mr Sidgwick prefers 'before the time', which is an equally possible sense of the word and gives, divested of metaphor, the real meaning. But *ὑπὲρ ἄστρων* seems scarcely intelligible without the assisting contrast of *πρὸ καιροῦ* in the local and metaphorical sense.

378. **ἠλίθιον** predicate, to be taken with the verb.

379. *It is a stroke of* Zeus *which they are able to proclaim. This thought it is permissible to follow out.* The elders themselves *οὐκ ἔχουσι* (*are not able*) to join

πάρεστι τοῦτ' ἐξιχνεῦσαι·
ἔπραξεν ὡς ἔκρανεν. οὐκ ἔφα τις
θεοὺς βροτῶν ἀξιοῦσθαι μέλειν
ὅσοις ἀθίκτων χάρις
πατοῖθ'· ὁ δ' οὐκ εὐσεβής.
πέφανται δ' ἐγγονοῦ-
σα τόλμη τῶν Ἄρη
πνεόντων μεῖζον ἢ δικαίως,
φλεόντων δωμάτων ὑπέρφευ
ὑπὲρ τὸ βέλτιστον. ἔστω δ', ἀπή-
μαντον ὥστ' ἀπαρκεῖν
εὖ πραπίδων λαχόντα.
οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἔπαλξις
πλούτου πρὸς κόρον ἀνδρὶ
λακτίσαντι μέγαν Δίκας
βωμὸν εἰς ἀφάνειαν.

381. ὡς ἔπραξεν ὡς. 385—6. ἐγγόνους ἀτολμήτων. 394. μεγάλα.

---

in the celebration, inasmuch as they are more than doubtful of the fact to be celebrated. But there is an opportunity (πάρεστι), they say, to pursue the suggested truth, that *Zeus* does watch and does punish: and this accordingly they do, in general terms and without reference to the supposed capture of Troy. This dubious and somewhat feeble distinction is prompted by their peculiar and embarrassing situation. They cannot accept Clytaemnestra's proof, yet will not commit themselves to a denial. Naturally they soon quit the subject altogether.—**ἀνειπεῖν**: see ἀναγορεύω, a word proper to proclamation of a victory.

380. On the metre see Appendix II.

381. *He* (*i.e.* Zeus) *accomplishes as he determines.*—The convenient aorist, according as it is taken as *past definite* or as *gnomic*, does or does not imply a specific reference to the present case. In English the ambiguity can scarcely be preserved. —ἔπραξαν (Hermann).—The omission of ὡς (Hermann) is not strictly necessary; the elision ἐξιχνεῦσ', ὡς (*that*) is not inadmissible in lyrics. But the insertion may well have arisen from the want of punctuation after ἐξιχνεῦσαι.

381. **τις** *quidam.* It is probable that the poet has some passage of literature in view; and see *v.* 1578, where it appears that Aegisthus had entertained, and presumably expressed, an unfavourable opinion of Providence.

383. **ἀθίκτων χάρις** *the charm* or *spell of the inviolable*, *i.e.* the restraining 'power' which religion ought to exercise. For χάρις, in this sense of influence (upon the mind), cf. Eur. *Med.* 439 βέβακε δ' ὅρκων χάρις and note there.

385. **πέφανται ἐγγονοῦσα** literally 'is proved to have been pregnant' or 'to have been carrying offspring', by giving birth to it. When the consequence of sin comes, men see to what it was leading. The metaphor is fully worked out in *vv.* 749—773 of the play, which are the

thought we may pursue. As He determines, so He accomplishes. It was said by one that the gods deign not to regard sinners, when they trample upon the grace of sacredness. But impiously was it said. It is manifested, how pregnant is the insolence of a too defiant pride, when the fulness of the house grossly exceedeth the best. Which best shall be so much, as will let a man blest with sense live of it undistressed.

For there is no defence for that man, who in the pride of wealth doth spurn the mighty fixed foundation of Right, whereby he may be unseen: though strong is that obstinate

---

best commentary upon the present passage, *παλαίφατος γέρων λόγος...μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὄλβον τεκνοῦσθαι...ἐκ δ' ἀγαθᾶς τύχας γένει βλαστάνειν ἀκόρεστον οἰζύν κτλ.*; see notes there. Here the familiar train of thought is merely touched by a passing allusion.—As to the division of the words here I follow Hartung (*ἐκτίνουσα τόλμα τῶν*), but keep the letters of the MS. **ἐγγονοῦσα**, which the MS. offers, is clear both in form and meaning. The verb is formed like *ἐνεργεῖν*, and means 'to be *ἔγγονος*': *ἔγγονος* is capable of two senses, either 'in-bearing, containing offspring' (a synonym of *ἔντοκος*), or 'in-born, being contained as offspring'. The second sense occurs in Aristotle (see Lex. *s.v.*); from the first is derived *ἐγγονοῦσα*. **τόλμη** irregular for **τόλμᾱ**, which perhaps should be read; but there may have been good literary reason for the Ionic form here.—*πέφανται δ' ἐκγόνοις ἀτολμήτως* Bothe.—*πέφανται δ' ἔκγονοι* 'even the descendants of the wicked *perish*' (root *φεν-*) S. J. Warren, *Class. Rev.* II. 182.

389—391. *Which shall be, so much as will permit a man of sense to meet his needs without distress.* The subject of *ἔστω* ('let it be, let us put it at this') is *τὸ βέλτιστον* 'the standard' of wealth, which this sentence defines by the limiting clause *ὥστε κτλ.*: literally *and let this be*, '*so that a man may*' etc.—**ἀπήμαντον**: masc. and passive, *not vexed*. Also rendered 'harmless' and construed, as neuter, with *ἔστω*, the subject being, less naturally, supposed to be 'wealth'.—**ἀπαρκεῖν** literally 'to suffice from it': for the preposition cf. *ἀποζῆν* (*ὅσον ἀποζῆν enough to live upon* Thuc. I. 2), *ἀφορμή* a *fund* or *capital*, etc. For the personal use of *ἀρκῶ* 'I am sufficient (to myself)', there appears to be no other example. Even *P. V.* 648 *τοσοῦτον ἀρκῶ σοι σαφηνίσαι μόνον* 'I can only inform you as far as this' (cited by S.) is materially different. But it is natural and justifies itself.—**πραπίδων**: cf. the genitive with *ἔχειν πως*, as *ὡς εἶχε ποδῶν* 'with his best speed' (S.).—*λαχόντι* Auratus.

392—395. *For there is no defence for the man, who in the pride of wealth doth haughtily spurn the foundation of Right, whereby he may be hid.* **πλούτου** may be taken either as above or with *ἔπαλξις* ('there is no protection in riches' etc. Sidgwick: 'What defence are riches' etc. Kennedy).—**μεγάλα** (?), cf. *Theb.* 339 *ὄλοιθ' ὃς πόλει μεγάλ' ἐπεύχεται.* But **μέγαν** (Canter) is probably right. See Appendix II.—**βωμὸν** *foundation, pedestal* (not *altar*); the notion of fixity, solidity (cf. *βέβαιος*), is here more prominent than that of sanctity.—**εἰς ἀφάνειαν**: difficult. The explanations given are (1), as the majority, *λακτίσαντι εἰς ἀφάνειαν* 'spurning out of sight', or 'into destruction'. The objection to this is that the metaphor thus becomes grotesque and inconsistent with the notion of a *βωμός*, which the wicked may spurn, but could not spurn *away*. (2) As Hermann and others, *ἔπαλξις εἰς ἀφάνειαν* 'protection

βιᾶται δ' ἁ τάλαινα πειθώ, ἀντ. α'.
προβουλόπαις ἄφερτος ἄτας.
ἄκος δὲ παμμάταιον. οὐκ ἐκρύφθη,
πρέπει δέ, φῶς αἰνολαμπές, σίνος·
κακοῦ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον
τρίβῳ καὶ προcβολαῖς
μελαμπαγὴς πέλει
δικαιωθεὶς (ἐπεὶ
διώκει παῖς πτανὸν ὄρνιν)
πόλει πρόστριμμ' ἄφερτον †θείς.
λιτᾶν δ' ἀκούει μὲν οὔτις θεῶν,
τὸν δ' ἐπίστροφον τῶνδε
φῶτ' ἄδικον καθαιρεῖ.
οἷος καὶ Πάρις ἐλθὼν
ἐς δόμον τὸν 'Ατρειδᾶν
ᾔσχυνε ξενίαν τράπε-
ζαν κλοπαῖσι γυναικός.

401. προβολαῖς. 410. τῶν.

---

against destruction'. But ἀφανής means not *destroyed*, but *invisible*, *secret*, *concealed*, and 'εἰς is the wrong preposition' (S.). (3) ἔπαλξις εἰς ἀφάνειαν 'protection for concealment', whence the translation above. **εἰς** *for the purpose of*. —**ἀφάνειαν**. See the sequel οὐκ ἐκρύφθη, πρέπει δέ κτλ., *v.* 398. This connexion may explain why the words are separated from ἔπαλξις and placed at the end of the sentence; they strike the keynote of the passage following.

396. *Yet irresistible is that obstinate persuasion*, the self-persuasion, that is, of the wicked, that his wealth will in some way protect him. πειθώ means both persuasion to believe (*conviction*, as here, cf. Eur. *Hel.* 796 τίς τοῦδε πειθώ;) and persuasion to do (*temptation*). The second sense may be taken here ('Temptation forces him on' S.), but the other makes a better connexion. The strength of temptation is not here the question. **τάλαινα** *obstinate*; see *v.* 233, Eur. *Med.* 1057 ἔασον αὐτούς, ὦ τάλαν, φεῖσαι τέκνων (Medea appeals to her heart).

397. **προβουλόπαις ... ἄτας**: another difficult expression. The old interpretation was 'fore-counselling child of Infatuation'. To this it was objected (Hartung, Karsten) that the law of composition does not admit such a substantive in the supposed sense, an objection not answered by producing exceptional *adjectives* such as αἰνόπαρις (Πάρις), αἰνοπατήρ etc. The compound substantive προβουλό-παις ought to mean 'a παῖς who is a πρόβουλος' or 'who belongs to the class πρόβουλοι', where πρόβουλος is not adjective but substantive. πρόβουλος meant in Greek politics 'one who prepares measures for the sanction of another'. In this sense it occurs in Aeschylus himself (*Theb.* 997), and not seldom elsewhere. It is coloured with technical meaning (as is also προβουλεύω), and describes not a

persuasion, servant of Blindness and shaper of her decree. Remedy is all vain. Unhidden the mischief glows with a baleful light. Like base metal beneath the rub and touch, he shows the black grain when brought to justice (for his pursuit is idle as the boy's who follows the flying bird), and leaves upon his people a fatal mark of the touching. Deaf to supplication, the gods condemn for wicked whosoever is conversant with such.

Such was the sin of Paris, who came to that house of the Atridae and dishonoured the hospitable board by theft of the

---

quality but a *function*, a *relative* function. A πρόβουλος is πρόβουλος *to another or others.* These facts suggest that in this compound παῖς also is a term of *function*, and means not *child* but *servant* or *handmaiden*, and that we should translate by *servant of Infatuation who prepareth her decrees*, literally 'the counsellor-servant of Até'. Self-deception, to drop the metaphor, prepares the way for judicial blindness. Such metaphors from occupations and functions are in the style of the poet; see his προχαλκεύει Ἄτη φασγανουργός, his πρόσπολος Φόνου, his προβατογνώμων, and the like.—προβούλου παῖς ... ἄτας Hartung, πρόβουλος παῖς Karsten: see Appendix II. — **ἄφερτος** 'tyrannous', lit. 'insupportable'.

398—408. *Remedy is all in vain.... Like base metal at the rub and touch he shows the black grain under justification ...and sets upon his people a fatal mark of his touch. Deaf to supplication, the gods condemn for a wicked man him who is conversant with such.* The general meaning is that, as wealth will not serve, so neither will power, such as the power of a mighty state, to avert the punishment of the wicked. He will only ruin those who adopt his guilt.—**ἐπεὶ** ..**ὄρνιν** is a parenthesis, and the metaphor of the rubbed metal is pursued after it as before it. **πρόστριμμα**, lit. 'that which is rubbed on to' a thing, being correlative to τρίβος.—It is additionally recommended by the use of προστρίβειν *to inflict* a punishment (Aesch. *P. V.* 345 Paley).—**δικαιωθεὶς** *when justified, i.e.* 'brought to justice' or 'to punishment'. (?) This (see L. and Sc.) is the meaning which δικαιόω seems to have, where it is used with a personal object. It suits with the words τρίβῳ...πέλει, but not well with πόλει πρόστριμμα...θείς, which, however, need not be closely connected with it.—The rendering 'tested' is not supported, so far as I can discover, by any example or analogy.—**πόλει**, *i.e.* πολίταις, see *Theb.* 57, 1021 etc.—**ἄφερτον θείς**. This metre though not impossible (see Appendix II) is harsh. Perhaps the order should be changed to **πρόστριμμα θεὶς ἄφερτον**. The *Cod. Farn.* has a conjecture, ἄφερτον ἐνθείς, but ἐν- is not good: ἀνθείς (from ἀνατιθέναι) *put upon* is possible; but the correct preposition is already given by πρόσ-τριμμα and no compound would be quite satisfactory except προσθείς.—**ἐπεὶ**... **ὄρνιν** *for his pursuit is that of the boy after the flying bird*; the hope of the malefactor and his friends that they may escape punishment is futile.—**προσβολαῖς** Pearson.—**τῶνδε** better taken not as neuter but as masculine, as in the Homeric phrase ἐπίστροφος ἦν ἀνθρώπων (*Od.* I. 177). The plural includes the whole company of the wicked with the original malefactor.—**ἄδικον** predicate with **καθαιρεῖ**, which probably has its judicial sense, 'to condemn' or 'sentence' (not 'to destroy' though this is indirectly implied), as in ἡ καθαιροῦσα ψῆφος (Lysias) etc.—Dr. Headlam suggests, but with hesitation, that τῶν (for τῶνδε, see *v.* 390) may anticipate ἀδίκων, 'those, the wicked' *more Homerico*.—On the metrical points see Appendix II.

λιποῦσα δ' ἀστοῖσιν ἀσπίστορας στρ. β'.
κλόνους λογχίμους τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὁπλισμούς,
ἄγουσά τ' ἀντίφερνον Ἰλίῳ φθορὰν
βέβακε ῥίμφα διὰ πυλᾶν,
ἄτλητα τλᾶσα· πολὺ δ' ἀνέστενον
τόδ' ἐννέποντες δόμων προφῆται·
"ἰὼ ἰὼ δῶμα δῶμα καὶ πρόμοι,
ἰὼ λέχος καὶ στίβοι φιλάνορες.
πάρεστι σιγᾶς ἄτιμος ἀλοίδορος
ἄδιστος ἀφεμένων ἰδεῖν.
πόθῳ δ' ὑπερποντίας
φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν.
εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν
ἔχθεται χάρις ἀνδρί,
ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις
ἔρρει πᾶσ' Ἀφροδίτη.
ὀνειρόφαντοι δὲ πειθήμονες ἀντ. β'.
πάρεισι δόξαι φέρουσαι χάριν ματαίαν.
μάταν γὰρ εὖτ' ἂν ἐσθλά τις δοκῶν ὁρᾶν...,

419.. *ἰὼ* and *δῶμα* not repeated. 429. *πενθήμονες*.

---

413. **ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λογχίμους τε** *the din of shield and spear*, **καὶ ναυβάτας ὁπλισμούς** *and the arming of fleets.* **τε** couples the adjectives *ἀσπίστορας* and *λογχίμους*, **καί** couples *ναυβάτας ὁπλισμούς* to the whole phrase preceding. See Appendix II.

415—422. See Appendix K.

416. **βέβακε̄**. The vowel is lengthened by the following *ῥ*.

417. **πολὺ δ' ἀνέστενον**: for metre see Appendix II.

423. **πόθῳ...ἀνάσσειν** *so pining for her that is far beyond sea, the lord of the house may pass for a mere phantom*: 'den Herrscher des Hauses wird man nicht für einen machtvollen Herrscher, sondern für ein Schattenbild halten' (Wecklein). The tone, as in the preceding sentence, is still mocking.—I am sorry to abandon for this interpretation the old and familiar one 'in his longing for the lost wife a phantom of her will seem to rule his home'. But this, however poetical, is not in the Greek. It is not naturally conceivable that the subject of *δόξει* should be other than *ὁ ποθῶν*. It will no doubt seem to many, as to me, that Dr Wecklein's rendering destroys what they most admire in the passage. And yet it may be indisputably right.

427. **ὀμμάτων ἐν ἀχηνίαις** *in the want of the eyes.* The question is raised whether the 'eyes' are those of the husband, or of the lost wife, or of the blankly-gazing statues, a question which cannot and must not be answered. The eyes of the husband seek, but no longer

wife. Leaving to her countrymen the din of shield and spear and the arming of fleets, and bringing to Ilium ruin for her dower, she had passed with light step, careless of sin, through the gates. And oft they sighed, the interpreters of the home, as they said, 'Ah for the home! aha, for the home! Aha, and ah, for the princes thereof, for the husband's bed yet printed with her embrace. We can see him there, his curses mocked with silence, the parted spouse, the sweetest sight of them all! He shall pine for her that is far beyond sea, the lord of the house, till he seems but a phantom lord. Grace of beautiful idols the husband hateth: in the want of the eyes all the passion is gone. Dream-forms stay with him a while, convincing semblances, and offer delight in vain; for lo, when seeing his joy he vainly would embrace, the vision escapes through his arms,

---

find, the eyes that were wont to answer, and, for lack of this response, love is for him no more. It is the advantage of the language here that it is ambiguous between 'absence of eyes' and 'hunger of eyes'.—Prof. Bury (*Class. Rev.* II. 182) points out that to a Greek ear *κολοσσός* (*κόλος, ὄσσε*) would suggest *eyeless*, and supposes the exceptional word to be chosen for this reason. This, for Aeschylus, is quite possible and would even be characteristic.

429. **πειθήμονες ... δόξαι** *persuading visions* or 'convincing', *i.e.* visions which compel belief in their reality, cf. Propertius 4. 11. 81 (a departed wife is addressing her husband) 'sat tibi sint noctes, quas de me, Paule, fatiges | *somniaque in faciem credita saepe meam*; | atque ubi secreto *nostra ad simulacra* loqueris | ut responsurae singula verba iace', Meleager *Anth. Gr.* 5. 166 *ἆρα μένει στοργῆς ἐμὰ λείψανα καὶ τὸ φίλημα | μνημόσυνον ψυχρᾷ θάλπετ' ἐν εἰκασίᾳ; | ἆρά γ' ἔχει σύγκοιτα τὰ δάκρυα, κἀμὸν ὄνειρον | ψυχαπάτην στέρνοις ἀμφιβαλοῦσα φιλεῖ;* (Housman, *Journal of Philology* XVI. 269).—**πενθήμονες** MS. 'mournful'. The alternative interpretations of this, (1) *sad-looking*, (2) *causing sadness*, are both unsatisfactory. (1) is pointless, and (2) is contrary to fact and the context. It cannot be said of the visions that *πενθήμονες πάρεισι*: on the contrary *φέρουσι χάριν*, though *ματαίαν*.—There is perhaps a third possible interpretation, *visions of mourning*, *i.e.* visions which arise before the disturbed mind of the mourner. We might cite Propertius for this also: the ghost of Cynthia appears to her lover 'cum mihi somnus ab exsequiis penderet' (4. 7. 5). This explanation I should take, if *πενθήμονες* be retained.

431. "'For vainly, when, dreaming that he beholds his joy (*he would embrace her*), the vision slips through his hands and is gone'. The construction, which has given much trouble, is an ellipse, the verb being suppressed *εὐφημίας ἕνεκα*"; Dr Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XII. 246), citing Theocr. i. 105 *οὐ λέγεται τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος*—, Simon. Amorg. 7. 110 *κεχηνότος γὰρ ἀνδρὸς—οἱ δὲ γείτονες χαίρουσ' ὁρῶντες*, and many passages from the lighter literature. Since this accounts not only for the defective grammar, but also for the vagueness of *ἐσθλά* ("the Attic *ἀγαθά*" Headlam), the evidence in favour of it is very strong indeed. But it is then imperative to suppose that this whole passage, *vv.* 419—434, is satirical

παραλλάξασα διὰ χερῶν
βέβακεν ὄψις οὐ μεθύστερον
πτεροῖς ὀπαδοῖς ὕπνου κελεύθοις."
τὰ μὲν κατ' οἴκους ἐφ' ἑστίας ἄχη,
τὰ δ' ἔστι, καὶ τῶνδ' ὑπερβατώτερα.
τὸ πᾶν δ' ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος αἴας συνορμένοις
πένθει' ἀτλησικάρδιος
δόμων ἑκάστου πρέπει.
πολλὰ γοῦν θιγγάνει πρὸς ἧπαρ·
οὓς μὲν γὰρ παρέπεμψεν
οἶδεν, ἀντὶ δὲ φωτῶν
τεύχη καὶ σποδὸς εἰς ἑκά-
στου δόμους ἀφικνεῖται.
ὁ χρυσαμοιβὸς δ' Ἄρης σωμάτων στρ. γ′.
καὶ ταλαντοῦχος ἐν μάχῃ δορὸς

436. τάδ' ἐστὶ. 438. πένθεια τλησικάρδιος. 441. γὰρ ἔπεμψεν.

---

or semi-satirical in tone, and is to be assigned to speakers who could use such a tone; which however is probable on other grounds; see Appendix K. All Dr Headlam's examples (except Soph. *O. T.* 1288, a peculiar case) are from comedy or the like, and indeed such an aposiopesis is plainly incompatible with pure pathos or perfect dignity. Nothing like it appears to occur in Attic tragedy elsewhere.—εὖτ' ἂν ἐς θιγὰς δοκᾶν ὁρᾷ, *when he looks to touch the phantom*, Housman, citing Eur. *frag.* 162 ἀνδρὸς δ' ὁρῶντος ἐς Κύπριν νεανίου ἀφύλακτος ἡ τήρησις. The form θιγή is assumed, legitimately, from θιγεῖν.

434. *With wings that follow the passing of sleep.* The dative κελεύθοις, depending on ὀπαδοῖς (cf. ἕπομαι), may be right, though perplexing to the ear. ὀπαδὸς (Auratus) is the simplest change: the adjectival ὀπαδὸς might well in Aeschylus take πτεροῖς as an instrumental dative.—πτεροῖς ὀπαδοῦσ(α) Dobree.—**κελεύθοις**, commonly ὁδοῖς, cf. *v.* 131.

435. **ἐφ' ἑστίας.** ἐφεστίους (Voss). This merely expresses the same sense in a more ordinary way. But a poet is at liberty to prefer an unusual way, and we may even think that the cumulation of ἐφ' ἑστίας (the more intimate expression) upon κατ' οἴκους has a poetical effect.

436. **τὰ δ'** (Halm).—**ἔστι** should be accented as emphatic. It marks the true present time of *v.* 436, as opposed to the 'historic' time of *v.* 435. The connexion of thought is this: 'Such are the sufferings *at home* (κατ' οἴκους) of those (ἐφ' ἑστίας) most nearly concerned (the Atridae, particularly Menelaus); and other sufferings they have *now*, even greater (the miseries of war being added to the first loss); and throughout Hellas, since they (the princes and their army) went away, there is sorrow'. Both *v.* 436 and *v.* 437 are separately antithetic in different ways to *v.* 435.—If τάδ' ἐστί be written, so that the antithesis is merely between τὰ μέν and τὸ πᾶν δέ, there is an ill-marked transition of time from the past to the present.—**τῶνδ' ὑπερβατώτερα** *more surpassing than these*, an unusual (active)

and is gone that instant, on wings that follow the passing of sleep'.

Such the home-sorrow before they parted hence; and other woes they have, woes surpassing yet beyond these. And in every home of those who set forth together from Hellas' land the hearts of their women-folk ache, as ache they must, with all they have to wound them. Whom they sped forth, them they know; but it is not the man they know that comes to his home; it is but an urn and ashes. A merchant in gold is Ares, and bodies of men are his gold: in battle he holdeth his scale. He

---

sense of ὑπέρβατος, and a redundant, or rather inaccurate, use of the comparative formation, where 'surpassing these' would be logical.

437. **τὸ πᾶν δὲ** *generally, universally, i.e.* 'in reference to the commons', as opposed to τὰ ἐφ' ἑστίας, the domestic concerns of the princes. Cf. τὸ πολύ, τὸ πλεῖστον, etc.—**συνορμένοις** 'since they (the princes and their army) went away together'. For this 'dative absolute', as it may almost be called, see on *Theb.* 217 and hereafter on *v.* 1277.—**Ἑλλάδος**. **Ἕλλανος** Bamberger for metre, perhaps rightly, but see Appendix II.

438—440. **πένθεια**. Formerly translated *grief, mourning.* But πένθεια, as from an adjective πενθής, would be a word of irregular formation. Adjectives in -ης are properly formed from words such as πένθος, πενθεῖν by composition, *e.g.* δυσπενθής. So τέλος, τελεῖν, ἐντελής, but not τέλεια *perfection.* Nor is the genitive δόμων well constructed.—Translate: *there is and must be heart-ache for the women of every house*, literally, 'the kinswoman of each man's house is heavy at heart of course'. See Appendix L. **ἀτλησικάρδιος** *broken-hearted* (Headlam) is preferable to τλησικάρδιος *enduring.* —**πρέπει** *is naturally.* This is the force here rather than 'is conspicuously'. The use of the verb is akin to its common impersonal use (πρέπει *it is fit*), and may be approximately illustrated by *Pers.* 242 πότερα γὰρ τοξουλκὸς αἰχμὴ διὰ χερῶν αὐτοῖς πρέπει; 'Is the bow the weapon natural to their hands?' and Soph. *O. T.* 9 πρέπων πρὸ τῶνδε φωνεῖν, 'marked as their natural spokesman'. It is this πρέπει to which **γοῦν** in *v.* 440 refers: 'she is sad *naturally*, for indeed she has much to grieve her'.

440. **θιγγάνει** (αὐτῆς) **πρὸς ἧπαρ** *wounds her to the heart.*

441. **παρέπεμψεν** (Bothe) *those whom she sped on*, sent away with cheer and encouragement. The preposition, bearing the same shade of meaning as in παρακελεύειν, adds to the irony of the contrast. The loss is accounted for by the similarity of ΓΑΡΠΑΡ.—τις ἔπεμψεν Porson (and many texts); but this has less graphic probability. It has been recommended by the necessity of supplying a subject to ἔπεμψεν, which is already supplied under the foregoing interpretation.—See further Appendix II.

442. "Notice the beautiful effect in this pathetic line of the implied antithesis to οἶδεν; instead of the familiar and loved face comes back the unknown urn and ashes" (Sidgwick).

445. "The 'dust in the urn' suggests a bold figure to the poet. 'War is a gold-merchant dealing in bodies; he has his balance (holding the scales of fight, a Homeric idea from *Il.* 8. 69, where Zeus weighs fates); he sends back **ψῆγμα** *dust*, **πυρωθὲν** and **βαρὺ** *burnt* and *heavy* (*grievous*), like gold-dust, but in another sense; he fills the jar with ashes in place of men'" (Sidgwick).

πυρωθὲν ἐξ Ἰλίου
φίλοισι πέμπει βαρὺ
ψῆγμα δυσδάκρυτον, ἀν-
τήνορος σποδοῦ γεμί-
ζων λέβητας εὐθέτου.
στένουσι δ' εὖ λέγοντες ἄν-
δρα τὸν μὲν ὡς μάχης ἴδρις,
τὸν δ' ἐν φοναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ'—
ἀλλοτρίας διαὶ γυναικός·
τάδε σῖγά τις βαΰζει,
φθονερὸν δ' ὑπ' ἄλγος ἕρπει
προδίκοισιν Ἀτρείδαις.
οἱ δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τεῖχος
θήκας Ἰλιάδος γᾶς
εὔμορφοι κατέχουσιν· ἐχ-
θρὰ δ' ἔχοντας ἔκρυψεν.
βαρεῖα δ' ἀστῶν φάτις σὺν κότῳ† · ἀντ. γ΄.
δημοκράτου δ' ἀρᾶς τίνει χρέος.

450. γεμίξων (?). 455. διά.

---

451. **εὐθέτου** literally 'convenient'; the old translation 'easily stowed' is not far from the implied sense, but a little more than the meaning of the word. The general notion is 'convenience', as comes out clearly in *εὐθετεῖν to be convenient, handy* (*εὐθετεῖ πᾶσι χρήσασθαι* Theophrastus), and specially the convenience which comes of being in small compass. So in Hesiod (*Theog.* 541) Prometheus, binding the bones of an ox in fat to deceive Zeus, first packs them together, *εὐθετίσας κατέθηκε καλύψας ἀργέτι δημῷ*. So in Aesch. *frag.* 238 shoes for running are termed *εὔθετοι ἀρβύλαι* from their 'convenient' lightness and other adaptation. (The word appears, as a conjecture of one of the later copyists, in *Theb.* 629, but see note there.) Here it is an epithet borrowed from the merchant's gold-dust, whose *convenience* of small bulk, ready exchange etc., is a chief part of its value. To the ashes it is applicable only in bitter irony, because, as compared with the living man, they are so small in bulk and so quickly disposed of.—*εὐθέτους* (Auratus) is a mistaken change. The 'convenience' of the goldsmith's vessels (*i.e.* the urns of the dead) is not to the point; still less that they are 'well-ordered' (as the word is sometimes rendered).

455. **διαί** Hermann.

456. **τάδε**, *i.e.* the last words *ἀλλοτρίας διαὶ γυναικός*, not of course the praises of the dead. Wecklein marks the natural pause.—**βαΰζει** *snarls*; the word signifies the tones of the dog.—**τις** *some one*; this differs from *βαΰζουσι* and is more picturesque. When the praises of the dead are sounded, some one (an emissary for example of the conspirators) will generally put in the malicious suggestion.—**σῖγα** *in*

sends from Ilium dust out of his fire, a heavy gold to weeping love, powder that once was a man, now pressed into the compass of a jar.

And they lament them, telling their praises, how skilled was the dead in battle, or how bravely he shed his blood—'And all through another's wife', snarls some one in a whisper: and so there spreads a resentful anger against the quarrel of the sons of Atreus.

Others there by the town, in their own shapes, possess graves in Trojan earth, which hating them doth hide its fair possessors away.

Now when one anger moves a people, there is danger in their talk; it is a bond no less than a covenant sworn.

---

a whisper. In this and the like passages (see L. and Sc. *s.v.*) the word retains the effect of its origin and its connexion with σίζω (stem σῑγ-) *to hiss.*

457. **φθονερὸν . . . Ἀτρείδαις** *there spreads an indignant grief against the sons of Atreus as foremost in the quarrel.* **ὑπὸ...ἕρπει** *i.e.* ὑφέρπει. This intransitive use is to be distinguished from that in *v.* 282 χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει. For ἕρπειν *to grow* see on *Theb.* 17.—**προδίκοισιν**: cf. ἀντίδικος in *v.* 41. The δίκη is the cause of the Atridae against Troy. But the exact sense of πρόδικος is hard to fix, from the rarity of the word and of similar words. It seems here to be invidious; a laudatory or neutral epithet would cumber the sentence. As πρόμαχος is *forward in battle*, πρόχειρος *handy*, πρόκωπος *ready with the sword*, and πρόλεσχος *too ready with talk*, so πρόδικος may be *forward* or *too ready in suit*, in short *litigious*, and this would fit well, the point being that the princes are too eager in urging their private interest.—Or it may be 'as the chief persons in the quarrel' (*als die Führer des Rachezugs*, Wecklein). This has practically the same effect.

460. *Others possess graves there by the town in Trojan earth, which hating them doth hide its fair possessors away.* The Greek feeling for the beauty of the body is here touched with a strange pathos. **εὔμορφοι**, though joined with κατέχουσιν, takes force from its antithesis to **ἔκρυψεν**. —There is irony in **κατέχουσιν...ἔχοντας**, words used naturally of conquerors who *occupy* land (Sidgwick).—ἐχθρὰ δ' ἔχθοντας Orelli.

463. **βαρεῖα** *dangerous.*—Read **συγκότων** *when united in anger*, possessed by a common feeling of indignation. The compound σύγκοτος is similar to συμπαθής *united in feeling*, σύναιμος *united in blood*, σύνορκος *bound by a joint oath*, and σύμφρων *one in mind* (*v.* 112). It answers to ἀλλόκοτος (properly *differing in humour*) as συμφρονεῖν answers to ἀλλοφρονεῖν. For the union with a preposition we have ὑπέρκοτος and ἐπίκοτος. The point is that when there is among the people *a common* indignation (not indignation simply), a conspiracy, or something like it, grows up naturally out of daily intercourse and conversation (φάτις).—With **σὺν κότῳ** the meaning must be the same (see next verse), but it is not well expressed.

464: *it performs the obligation of a sworn conspiracy*: the subject is φάτις, the talk by which malcontents are drawn together.—**δημοκράτου ἀρᾶς** *a popular conjuration*, a curse by which the people bind themselves together; see *vv.* 1234, 1396. The metaphor κρᾶσις *mixture*, ap-

μένει δ' ἀκοῦσαί τί μου
μέριμνα νυκτηρεφές.
τῶν πολυκτόνων γὰρ οὐκ
ἀπόσκοποι θεοί. κελαι-
ναὶ δ' Ἐρινύες χρόνῳ
τυχηρὸν ὄντ' ἄνευ δίκας
παλιντυχῆ τριβᾷ βίου
τιθεῖσ' ἀμαυρόν, ἐν δ' ἀΐ-
στοις τελέθοντος οὔτις ἀλκά·
τὸ δ' ὑπερκόπως κλύειν εὖ
βαρύ· βάλλεται γὰρ ὄσσοις
Διόθεν κεραυνός.

474. *ὑπερκότως.*

---

plied to a league, covenant, or bond, is foreign to modern language but consecrated and characteristic in Greek; and it is specially applicable to a conjuration or religious bond. It was in fact more than a metaphor; it was an actual symbol; see the ritual of Atlantis as described in Plato (*Critias* p. 119). The ten kings annually renewed their compact with each other and with the law by first shedding the blood of a bull over a pillar, on which was written, together with the laws, 'an oath invoking great curses on whoever should break them (*ὅρκος μεγάλας ἀρὰς ἐπευχόμενος τοῖς ἀπειθοῦσι*)', and then *mixing drops of the bull's blood, one for each of them, in a bowl from which they drank, swearing as they did so to deal truly with each other according to the law* (*κρατῆρα κεράσαντες ὑπὲρ ἑκάστου θρόμβον ἐνέβαλλον αἵματος κτλ.*). Hence in Herodotus (4. 152) the beginning of a commercial league is expressed by the dedication of a *κρατήρ*, and we are told that *Θηραίοισι ἐς Σαμίους ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἔργου πρῶτα φιλίαι μεγάλαι συνεκρήθησαν*. So in the *Seven against Thebes* (43) the forlorn hope of the besiegers bind themselves together till death by putting their hands while they swear into blood poured in a shield, which serves for the occasion the function of a *κρατήρ*. See also the oaths of Priam and Agamemnon *Il.* 3. 269 and notes there. From this ritual and symbolism came many familiar terms of compact, such as *συγκεράσασθαι φιλίαν*, *συγκεκρᾶσθαί τινι* (*to be united with another*), *συμμῖξαι συμβόλαια* etc. Hence *δημόκρατος ἀρά* properly describes a 'conjuration' of the people, a covenant of rebellion solemnized with imprecation; and the point here is that the bond of a common indignation irregularly communicated from mouth to mouth may be as dangerous to authority as a sworn conspiracy. It will be observed that what the speakers fear is not the unimaginable thing which happens, but a popular outbreak against the representatives of the king.—**τίνει χρέος** 'it performs (literally 'pays') the obligation'. The *φάτις* is said itself to do that which it causes to be done. The metaphor pursues the idea of a covenant suggested by *δημοκράτου*.—*δημοκράντου* (Porson) gives the sense 'a curse decreed by the people.' The public curses upon offenders were an important part of early Greek legislation and were regularly registered with the laws (see a

And I am expecting in trouble to hear of some secret of the dark.

For whosoever are guilty of lives, upon them God's eyes are fixed. The time comes when fortune unmerited turns to misfortune at a touch, when the dark Chastisers take the man's strength away: and once he is gone, no help for him. Glory too high is dangerous; it is upon the peaks that the bolt of

---

specimen from Teos in Roberts' *Greek Inscriptions* No. 142). *δημόκραντος ἀρά* is therefore a very good expression in itself; but no change is required.

465. **μένει...νυκτηρεφές**: apparently intended, notwithstanding the order, to be construed as *μέριμνά μου μένει ἀκοῦσαί τι*, 'my anxiety expects news.'—The order suggests that *μου* depends on *ακοῦσαι*, and in ed. 1 I adopted this, with the rendering *and I await with boding a voice from the darkness of my thoughts* (literally 'and anxiety waits to hear from me something, which darkness covers'), but I now think this too difficult.

467. **οὐκ ἀπόσκοποι** 'they do not look away from them,' *i.e.* they watch them with fixed eyes.—*ἄσκοποι* Cod. Farn., but see Appendix II.—**τῶν πολυκτόνων**: including those who, like the Atridae, reckon lives lightly in the pursuit of their ends.

471. **παλιντυχῆ...βίου** *when in the course of life his luck is reversed*, but the metaphor in *τριβῄ* is uncertain.—*παλιντυχεῖ* (Scaliger) does not alter the sense.

473. **τελέθοντος** 'when he *is finally*': cf. Eur. *Andr.* 780 *ἀδὺ μὲν γὰρ αὐτίκα τοῦτο, ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ τελέθει ξηρόν*, and see on Eur. *Med.* 1096.

474. **ὑπερκόπως** (Grotius) **κλύειν εὖ** *to be praised too much.*

475. **βαρύ** *dangerous*, see *v.* 463.—**ὄσσοις**: a difficult word, as appears from the thirteen proposed corrections cited by Wecklein. The order and rhythm indicate that the dative depends upon *βάλλεται*. With *βάλλειν*, as with many verbs, simple cases sometimes express in poetry relations usually and in prose more accurately given by prepositions. Thus here *βάλλεται* is used like *ἐπιβάλλεται*, and the dative stands for the object of aim. Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1385 *λόγχην ἐνώμα στόματι*, Eur. *Med.* 1285 *χέρα βαλεῖν* (*i.e.* *προσβαλεῖν*) *τέκνοις* and note there. So *πρέπειν* (*Theb.* 117) takes the genitive proper to *διαπρέπειν*. On the other hand that 'the bolt of Zeus strikes *the eyes*' is neither true as a fact nor significant as a figure. To make sense, we want some type of greatness or height, the *peaks* for instance, which 'the thunder strikes', as Horace says illustrating the same topic. Hence the suggestions *Ὄσσᾳ* (Lobeck), *ὄρεσσιν* and *ὄχθοις* (Weil), *ὀρόγκοις* *peaks* (Ahrens), *κρόσσαις* *pinnacles* (Schneidewin) etc. But how do we know that *ὄσσοις* itself does not mean *peaks*? Not because it means 'eyes': every language has many words of double and treble signification. Not by its form, for the very word *ὄσσε*, *eyes*, is evidence for the likelihood of a word *ὄσσος* (or *ὄσσον*) *point*, being derived from the stem *ὀκ-*, of which the original notion was *sharpness* (cf. *ὄκρις* a *point* and the cognate Latin *ac-ies ac-us*). The fact that *acies* means *point* or *edge*, does not prevent it from meaning also *sight*, *line of battle*, etc. In such cases of ambiguity, one meaning tends to oust the rest; and so it appears to have been in this case, if the present *ὄσσοις* is the only extant example of the meaning *points* or *peaks*. The meanings discarded from common use will nevertheless be preserved here and there. I would therefore retain *ὄσσοις* and translate, after Horace, *for the bolts of heaven fall upon the peaks*, 'feriuntque summos fulgura montes.'—*κάρανα* Tucker, *Class. Rev.* VII. 340.

κρίνω δ' ἄφθονον ὄλβον·
μὴ δ' εἴην πτολιπόρθης
μήτ' οὖν αὐτὸς ἁλοὺς ὑπ' ἄλ-
λων βίον κατίδοιμι.

πυρὸς δ' ὑπ' εὐαγγέλου
πόλιν διήκει θοὰ
βάξις· εἰ δ' ἐτητύμως,
τίς οἶδεν; ἦ τοι θεῖόν ἐστι, μὴ ψύθος.
Τίς ὧδε παιδνὸς ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος,
φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν
νέοις πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ'
ἀλλαγᾷ λόγου καμεῖν;
Ἐν γυναικὸς αἰχμᾷ πρέπει
πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξυναινέσαι.

484. $\overset{\text{ει}}{\text{ἤ}}$. ἐστὶν.

---

477. **κρίνω**: properly 'separate' or 'sift out', and so *prefer, choose*.—**ἄφθονον** *unenvied*: not as commonly 'unstinted, abundant'.

478. **μὴ δ' εἴην** need not be altered to *μήτ' εἴην*. The connexion is this: 'I choose an unenvied prosperity; and (*δέ*) I would fain not (*μή*) be a conqueror, nor yet (*μήτ' οὖν*)' etc.

480. **μήτ'...κατίδοιμι**: 'nor may I ever know the life of a captive' (?) is said to be the meaning; literally, 'nor may I, myself subdued, see my life subject to another'.—*βίον κατέδοιμι*, 'eat the bread (*βίος* sustenance, nourishment) of captivity', Valckenaer; but neither is this satisfactory.

481—493. Conversation in lyric recitative between the elders (Wecklein). See above on *vv.* 363—366.

481—493. The alleged 'message of the beacon' must be spreading, though it is quite uncertified and probably false.

483. **ἐτητύμως**: supply *ἀγγέλλοντος διήκει κτλ.*, *ἀγγέλλοντος* being supplied from *εὐ-αγγέλου*. The antithesis is between the adverbs *εὖ* and *ἐτητύμως*: the signal gives *good* news, but does it give *true?*—*ἐτήτυμος* (*ἐστὶν ἡ βάξις*) Auratus.

484. **ἦ τοι θεῖόν ἐστι, μὴ ψύθος** (sc. *ὄν*) *it is indeed miraculous,—if not false.* An expression of contemptuous disbelief. The subject of the sentence in Greek, as in the English, is the general subject, *τὸ πρᾶγμα* 'the thing'. The force of *θεῖος* is illustrated by Herodotus (2. 66) on the behaviour of the Egyptian cats, which leap into a fire, *πυρκαιῆς δὲ γενομένης θεῖα πρήγματα καταλαμβάνει τοὺς αἰελούρους.* The supplement of the verbal *ὄν* from *ἐστι* in the principal clause is similar to that of the adjectival *ὄν* in such cases as Plato *Phaedr.* 240 D *ὁρῶντι ὄψιν πρεσβυτέραν καὶ οὐκ ἐν ὥρᾳ* (*οὖσαν*). It is irregular but seems not impossible. See *v.* 547.—Of the many changes proposed, that of O. Müller, **ἦ τοι θεῖόν ἐστιν ἢ ψύθος**, is the nearest to the MS. and gives the same sense as the text. Many (*e.g.* *μή τι θεῖόν ἐστι δὴ ψύθος;* Weil) introduce

heaven strikes. Nay, let my happiness challenge no jealousy: and let me be no conqueror, nor see myself a conquered slave.

First Elder. The beacon hath spoken fair, and the report is spreading swiftly among the folk; but hath it spoken true? Who knows? It is indeed miraculous,—if not false.

Second Elder. How can one be so childish, so crazed of wit, to fire with hope at a sudden message of flame, and risk the pain of altered news?

Third Elder. With woman's impulse it is natural to give indulgent credit before the proof.

---

the suggestion that the signal is a 'deception of the gods' (*θεῖον ψύθος*). But if the speaker suspects any one, it is the queen: see the next lines.

485—488. **τίς ὧδε παιδνὸς κτλ.** 'Who is so childish' etc. *i.e.* 'Is there any one so childish?' This second speaker takes up the hint of the preceding and gives it a stronger turn. The rashness of the queen, in acting upon such an uncertified report, is more than natural. Does she really believe? To which the next speaker answers that it is possible in a woman.

487. **νέοις,** *i.e. νέοις οὖσιν* 'when they are fresh'. Why not await confirmation?—**πυρωθέντα**: for heat as a figure of sanguine rashness cf. Soph. *Ant.* 87 *θερμὴν ἐπὶ ψυχροῖσι καρδίαν ἔχεις.*—**πυρωθέντα...ἔπειτα καμεῖν** *i.e.* 'to let his feelings take fire at the first, when he must suffer if the news should change'. For the relation of sense between the participle and the verb, cf. Eur. *Med.* 1412 *οὓς μήποτ' ἐγὼ φύσας ὄφελον πρὸς σοῦ φθιμένους ἐπιδέσθαι whom I would I had never begotten, to see them slain by thee.*—The clause is consecutive (*ὥστε καμεῖν*) following *ὧδε*.

489. **ἐν...αἰχμᾷ πρέπει** 'with woman's impulsiveness it is natural' etc., literally 'in (a case of) a woman's impulse', *i.e.* where a woman's impulsiveness comes in. In Latin the corresponding use of *in* is common; in Greek it is rare, but see Antiphon 5. 59 *σὺ δέ με ἐν ἀφανεῖ λόγῳ* (*when you have no proof*) *ζητεῖς ἀπολέσαι.*—To omit *ἐν* (Scaliger) is simple, but unsafe.

489. **αἰχμᾷ** *impulse* or *natural temper*, regularly formed from the stem of *ἀΐσσω*. For the sense compare *θυμός spirit* with *θύω to rush*. Other words of like formation and meaning are *ῥύμη*, *ῥώμη*. The word occurs also in *P. V.* 418 *Ζεὺς ὑπερήφανον ἐνδείκνυσιν αἰχμήν*, and *Cho.* 628 *γυναικείαν ἄτολμον αἰχμάν* (Blomfield, Paley, and see L. and Sc. *s. v.*). Here the primitive notion of *impulse* is more prominent; the same variation occurs in *ὀργή*, meaning sometimes *anger* sometimes merely *mood*.

490. **χάριν ξυναινέσαι** *to give indulgent assent*, an assent which is not merited but conceded from the inclination of the hearer. The acc. *χάριν* is related to *ξυναινέσαι* as an adverbial or 'quasi-cognate' accusative, and expresses that the 'assent' is a 'favour' or act of partiality.—**πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος** *before proof*, where *τὸ φανέν* 'the thing being proved' stands for 'the proving of the thing'. This use of the participle, though logical, is very rare, having been expelled by the article with the infinitive (*πρὸ τοῦ φανῆναι*). Similar (if correct) is Thucydides 1. 142 *ἐν τῷ μὴ μελετῶντι ἀξυνετώτεροι ἔσονται* 'from not practising they will have less knowledge'.—Others translate by 'instead of what is evident', but the context indicates that *πρό* here is temporal.

Πιθανὸς ἄγαν ὁ θῆλυς ὅρος ἐπινέμεται
ταχύπορος· ἀλλὰ ταχύμορον
γυναικογήρυτον ὄλλυται κλέος.
Τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα λαμπάδων φαεσφόρων
φρυκτωριῶν τε καὶ πυρὸς παραλλαγάς,
εἴτ' οὖν ἀληθεῖς εἴτ' ὀνειράτων δίκην
τερπνὸν τόδ' ἐλθὸν φῶς ἐφήλωσεν φρένας·
κήρυκ' ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τόνδ' ὁρῶ κατάσκιον
κλάδοις ἐλαίας. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι κάσις
πηλοῦ ξύνουρος διψία κόνις τάδε,
ὡς οὔτ' ἄναυδος οὔτε σοι δαίων φλόγα
ὕλης ὀρείας σημανεῖ καπνῷ πυρός,
ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ χαίρειν μᾶλλον ἐκβάξει λέγων—
τὸν ἀντίον δὲ τοῖσδ' ἀποστέργω† λόγον·
εὖ γὰρ πρὸς εὖ φανεῖσι προσθήκη πέλοι.

---

491. **ἐπινέμεται**, lit. 'is occupied-over, is encroached upon', an irregular ancient passive: cf. *ἐπικηρυχθεὶς* 'having a price set upon him' in *Theb.* 621, and examples there cited. The application of *ἐπινέμεσθαι* to flocks which feed (*νέμονται*) on a neighbour's land illustrates the use (Donaldson, Paley); but the metaphor is taken directly from *νέμειν* or *νέμεσθαι to occupy land.*—**ὁ θῆλυς ὅρος** *i.e. τὸ θῆλυ* (*woman*) regarded as a *ὅρος.*—**γυναικογήρυτον.** *γηρύω*, generally used of sounds sharp and shrill, here suggests the female tone.

494. The herald is seen approaching.

494—5. **λαμπάδων ... φρυκτωριῶν ... πυρός.** The accumulation of synonyms has a certain contemptuous effect. 'We shall not depend on that sort of intelligence any more'.

496. **εἴτ' οὖν** 'whether, as we will suppose'.

498. **κατάσκιον κλάδοις ἐλαίας** 'with shade of olive-branch', *i.e.* with small branches of olive bound as a wreath upon his head. Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 130 *λεπτὰ φάρη ξανθὰν κεφαλὰν σκιάζειν*, and Simon. 150 *σκιάζειν ἔθειραν* of a chaplet. The speaker does not infer from the wreath the nature of the news (as the priest in Soph. *O. T.* 82 infers the success of Creon's mission to the oracle from his wreath of bay). What is inferred is that he comes *ἀπ' ἀκτῆς.* The herald is wreathed, as the ship itself was wreathed, in sign of gratitude to the gods for the safe conclusion of a voyage. See Propertius (3. 24. 15) *ecce coronatae portum tetigere carinae, | traiectae Syrtes, ancora iacta mihi est.* A similar description (*κλάδοισι νεοδρόποις κατάσκιον ὅμιλον*) is given of the newly arrived refugees in the *Suppliants* (358), the scene of which is laid on the coast of Argolis.

498—504. *The thirsty dust, sister of the mire and neighbour, testifies to me this, that...he will either explicitly bid us rejoice or*—etc.—What *dust* is meant, and how does it show that the herald brings some important news which will presumably throw light upon the recent report? The answers may be divided thus: (1) the dust is that which the herald raises; this shows his haste and therefore the im-

Fourth Elder. She is too ready of belief, a boundary quickly passed and encroached upon; but quick to pass away is the rumour that women cry.

First Elder. 'Twill not be long ere we know of this line of torch-bearers, this beacon-chain of succeeding fires, whether they be true, or whether this gladding light, a dream-like visitor, hath beguiled the sense. Yon herald comes from the shore, I see, with his shade of olive branch. And the information of the thirsty Dust, sister and neighbour to the Mire, assures me of this, that with something more than dumb signals of fire-smoke, more than a bonfire of wood burnt you upon a hill, he with a plain word will either explicitly bid us rejoice, or else—but the other word, for the sake of these, shall remain unspoken. May the fair appearance receive a like addition!

---

portance of his news; *sister and neighbour of mire* is a poetical description of dust in general: (2) the dust and the mud are upon the garments of the herald (the mud being on his shoes and the dust on his clothes they are 'neighbours' or 'contiguous'); they show that he has come a long way and so suggest that he has come from Troy (Paley). But neither is acceptable. As to (1), even supposing that one man running would make a noticeable dust, and that the herald is running, it would still be strange to cite the dust as evidence of the visible fact that he runs. Nor does this explanation account for the description 'sister of the mire and neighbour'. Paley's explanation (2) attempts this, but not successfully. See further Appendix M.

501. **σοι.** "The ethic dative emphasizes the tone of contempt for the reports of a beacon" (Wecklein). It has in fact precisely the same effect as in English.

502. **καπνῷ** contemptuous: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 946 *γραμμάτων καπνοὶ learned futilities.*

503. *Either his happy greeting will confirm the gladness,* literally 'he will fully express the announcement that we are to be glad by *saying* it'. **τὸ χαίρειν**: 'the *χαῖρε*', the formula of salutation. The herald's first act, according to custom (see *v.* 801), will be to salute the town. If his salutation is a *χαῖρε*, as it is (*v.* 513), well; if not,—. See the same thought differently turned in Soph. *Trach.* 225 *χαίρειν δὲ τὸν κήρυκα προυννέπω χρόνῳ | πολλῷ φανέντα, χαρτὸν εἴ τι καὶ φέρεις.* For the *ἀντίος λόγος* see the entrance of the Persian messenger announcing the battle of Salamis (*Pers.* 252), *ὦ γῆς ἁπάσης Ἀσιάδος πολίσματα,... ὤμοι κακὸν κτλ.*

504. **ἀποστέργω** *dislike, i.e.* shrink from. But the word is weak, and reasonably doubted. **ἀποστυγῶ**, Karsten. Perhaps **ἀποστέγω** *i.e. ἀποσιωπῶ*, 'I suppress, I leave unsaid', by an *aposiopesis.* *στέγειν* properly *to hold in* (of a net, a vessel etc.) is a poetic equivalent for *σιγᾶν* or *σιωπᾶν τι to refrain from saying.* See Soph. *Phil.* 136 *τί χρὴ στέγειν, ἢ τί λέγειν; what should be said or suppressed?*, *O. T.* 341 *ἥξει γὰρ αὐτὰ κἂν ἐγὼ σιγῇ στέγω even if I refrain from uttering them*, and other examples in L. and Sc. *s.v.*—**τὸν ἀντίον λόγον**: the alternative of disappointment.—**τοῖσδε** either (1) with **ἀντίον**, 'the opposite of this', which however makes the word superfluous; or (2) with **ἀποστέγω** (if that be read), 'out of respect for these' *i.e. τοῖς θεοῖς*, the

ΧΟ. β΄. ὅστις τάδ' ἄλλως τῇδ' ἐπεύχεται πόλει,
αὐτὸς φρενῶν καρποῖτο τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.

ΚΗΡΥΞ.

ἰὼ πατρῷον οὖδας Ἀργείας χθονός,
δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τῷδ' ἀφικόμην ἔτους,
πολλῶν ῥαγεισῶν ἐλπίδων μιᾶς τυχών·
οὐ γάρ ποτ' ηὔχουν τῇδ' ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονὶ
θανὼν μεθέξειν φιλτάτου τάφου μέρος.
νῦν χαῖρε μὲν χθών, χαῖρε δ' ἡλίου φάος,
ὕπατός τε χώρας Ζεὺς ὁ Πύθιός τ' ἄναξ,
τόξοις ἰάπτων μηκέτ' εἰς ἡμᾶς βέλη·
ἅλις παρὰ Σκάμανδρον ἦλθ' ἀνάρσιος·
νῦν δ' αὖτε σωτὴρ ἴσθι καὶ παιώνιος,
ἄναξ Ἄπολλον. τούς τ' ἀγωνίους θεοὺς
πάντας προσαυδῶ, τόν τ' ἐμὸν τιμάορον
Ἑρμῆν, φίλον κήρυκα, κηρύκων σέβας,

517. παγώνιος.

---

gods who stand before the palace and to whom the herald addresses himself below (*vv.* 514, 524). The pronoun is explained by a gesture. For the 'ethic' dative see σιωπῶ in Ar. *Ran.* 1134 ἐγὼ σιωπῶ τῷδε; 'am I to pay him the respect of silence?' and id. *Lys.* 530. To abstain from words of ill omen was a duty in a religious place or presence (see *e.g.* *Theb.* 234).

506—7. **ὅστις.** *Whoso utters this prayer with other intentions toward Argos* (*than ours*), etc. These lines should be given (as in the MS. and by Wecklein) to a new speaker. They have most point if assigned to one of the queen's partizans (see on *v.* 363), accepting the prayer of the elder but tacitly putting his own sense upon it.—The MS. gives *vv.* 494—505 to Clytaemnestra, *vv.* 506—7 to the chorus, and this is defended by Mr Prickard (*Class. Rev.* XIV. 434).

508. The herald enters, so utterly overcome by past suffering and present emotion that it is some time before he thinks to tell his news (*v.* 530), and indeed till he is addressed (*v.* 543) he scarcely seems to be aware that any one is present. From his first words (οὖδας) it would seem that he throws himself down, like Shakespeare's Richard II., to salute the beloved earth, and he thinks for the moment that he will die on the spot (μιᾶς τυχών *v.* 510). The whole speech is marvellously powerful.

509. **δεκάτῳ φέγγει τῷδ' ἔτους** *with this tenth annual dawn*, if the expression may pass. φέγγος ἔτους is an imitation of the common phrase φέγγος ἡμέρας. See the Introduction p. xl. The present 'light' is the dawn of the year as well as of the day. It is important here and throughout this scene to remember the supposed hour, just after sunrise.

510. **ῥαγεισῶν**: the metaphor intended is doubtful. A schol. refers it to anchors, one of which may hold when the rest *break*. Others (see L. and Sc. *s.v.*

A Conspirator. If there be any that agrees not in this patriot prayer, let him reap himself the consequence of his mistake.

[*Enter* a Herald.]

The Herald. O native earth, O Argos, my country, hail! With the dawn of this tenth year I am come to thee, at last. Many a hope hath broken, but one I have grasped; for I never thought I should die here, in this land of Argos, and have my plot in her well-beloved soil. But now I bless the land, I bless the bright sun, blessed be our Zeus supreme, and blessed he, the lord of Pytho; may he shoot his shafts not upon us any more. Long enough he came in enmity to Scamander's plain. But now be Saviour, O king Apollo, and Healer again! And the gods assembled here, I salute them all, him too, mine own protector, Hermes the Herald, whom heralds love and

---

ῥήγνυμι) render it by *wrecked*, as a ship, but in the passage cited for this (Demosth. p. 1289) ῥαγῆναι does not mean 'to be wrecked', but 'to spring a leak'. Probably the tradition of the scholia is correct.—**τυχών** belongs in any case not to the metaphor but properly to ἐλπίδος.

514. **ὕπατός τε Ζεύς**: supply χαιρέτω. The images of these and other deities are before the palace.

515. **βέλη**: τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν, prayer of Chryses to Apollo in *Il.* 1. 42.

516. **ἅλις...ἦλθε** *long enough he came in enmity to Scamander's plain*, as for instance on the occasion just mentioned, βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων χωόμενος κῆρ, τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων...ὁ δ' ἤιε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς. The descents of the gods upon the scene are a striking feature of Homeric story.—The deflexion into the third person, prepared by the nominatives in *v.* 514, is natural when referring to one not actually present, and has the advantage of sharpening the contrast between the hostile Apollo in the Troad and the friendly Apollo in Argos, the Apollo of the past and the Apollo of the present, by the return to the form of invocation in the next line, *where the resumption is marked by a fresh vocative* (ἄναξ Ἄπολλον) *inserted for the purpose.*—The change of ἦλθ' to ἦσθ' is undesirable.

517. **παιώνιος** Dobree.

518. **τοὺς ἀγωνίους θεοὺς** *these assembled gods* or *gods in assembly*. This term occurs also in the *Supplices* (195 and 248) for 'gods assembled in one place, and having one common worship', κοινοβωμίαν *Supp.* 228. No other sense is there possible, since the deities are recognized as collectively ἀγώνιοι by newly arrived foreigners, who have not yet identified any of them. There, as here, the reference is to the religious custom of Argos, and among the gods, there as here, are Zeus, Apollo, and Hermes. Probably therefore the sense here is the same and a similar κοινοβωμία is represented before the palace of Agamemnon (Wecklein).—Others interpret by ἀγοραῖοι 'the gods of an *agora*' (ἀγών). But ἀγοραῖος was not to Aeschylus the necessary sense, for the κοινοβωμία of the *Supplices* is not in an *agora* but in a lonely place near the sea.

519. **τόν τε** *and him*. τόν, like τοὺς in *v.* 518, is demonstrative (not 'and my defender'). **τιμάορον**: 'defender' because of the religious inviolability attaching to the persons of heralds, of whose office Hermes, the divine κῆρυξ, was patron.

ἥρως τε τοὺς πέμψαντας, εὐμενεῖς πάλιν
στρατὸν δέχεσθαι τὸν λελειμμένον δορός.
ἰὼ μέλαθρα βασιλέων, φίλαι στέγαι,
σεμνοί τε θᾶκοι, δαίμονές τ' ἀντήλιοι
(ἦ που πάλαι), φαιδροῖσι τοισίδ' ὄμμασιν
δέξασθε κόσμῳ βασιλέα πολλῷ χρόνῳ.
ἥκει γὰρ ἡμῖν, φῶς ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φέρων
καὶ τοῖσδ' ἅπασι κοινόν, Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.
ἀλλ' εὖ νιν ἀσπάσασθε, καὶ γὰρ οὖν πρέπει,
Τροίαν κατασκάψαντα τοῦ δικηφόρου
Διὸς μακέλλῃ, τῇ κατείργασται πέδον,
βωμοὶ δ' ἄιστοι καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματα
καὶ σπέρμα πάσης ἐξαπόλλυται χθονός.
τοιόνδε Τροίᾳ περιβαλὼν ζευκτήριον
ἄναξ Ἀτρείδης πρέσβυς εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ
ἥκει, τίεσθαι δ' ἀξιώτατος βροτῶν

534. *τοιούδε.*

---

524. **θᾶκοι**: seats for the king and probably for his councillors before the gate of the palace. Wecklein refers to Hom. *Od.* 2. 14, 3. 406.—**δαίμονές τ' ἀντήλιοι κτλ.** *and ye deities that look eastward (ah, what a while!), with this bright gladness in your eyes welcome fitly the long-absent king.* **ἀντήλιοι** 'eastward-looking', as in Soph. *Ai.* 805 *οἱ μὲν ἑσπέρους ἀγκῶνας οἱ δ' ἀντηλίους ζητεῖτε.*—**ἦ που πάλαι**: literally 'surely methinks a long while', a parenthetic comment upon *ἀντήλιοι*, from which the same adjective in a participial sense, *quasi ἀντήλιοι ὄντες*, is to be supplied. It must be remembered that in Greek *πάλαι εἰμί* represents the English 'I have long been'; in English it would be more natural though not absolutely necessary to repeat the verb in the perfect, 'ye that look eastward—and ah! how long ye have looked'.—**φαιδροῖσι** *bright* both literally and in the derived sense of 'glad'; a predicate.—**τοισίδ' ὄμμασιν** 'these eyes' *i.e.* 'your eyes as I now see them'.—**κόσμῳ**, dative of manner, combines the ideas of what is due and decent (cf. *κοσμίως* and see Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 82 *τὰ μὲν ὦν (πήματα) οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν*) and of honour.—The herald has come up from the port by the eastern road, and the king is coming from the same direction. The palace and the gods before it look towards the approach, and at this moment the faces of the statues are full-lit by the level morning rays. They beam (so thinks the man) with joy for the sun-like return of the king (*v.* 527), *as if, through the night of his absence, they had themselves felt it long to be looking seawards and Troywards in vain expectation.*—*εἴ που πάλαι if ever ye did before* (Auratus). For other suggestions see Wecklein's Appendix. The text should not be suspected.

527—528. *For our prince is returned,*

revere, and all the deified, them who sent forth the host, I bid them now receive it, so much as the spear hath spared. Hail royal palace, mansion beloved, and solemn seats, and deities eastward looking (and oh, how long ye have looked!); with this bright gladness in your eyes welcome fitly the king so long away. For our prince is returned, bringing light in darkness to impart unto all that are here, even Agamemnon our king.

But ye must greet him observantly, as is his due, having digged Troy out of the earth with the mattock of Zeus the Avenger, which hath broken her soil to dust. Her foundations cannot be found, or her fixed religious fanes, and all she might grow from is perishing out of the ground. So strong compulsion hath the elder son of royal Atreus put upon Troy, and happiest of mankind he comes home. None hath such claim to requital,

---

bringing light in darkness to impart unto all that are here; he is come, Agamemnon the king. **ἡμῖν**, a dative possessive or of the person interested (*commodi*), stands for Argos and the Argives generally, but also more particularly for the army, whom the *κῆρυξ* specially represents.—**καὶ τοῖσδ' ἅπασι κοινὸν** literally '(to be) shared with all here also'. The words are joined as a 'proleptic' predicate with *φέρων*. The 'light' of the victory has come to the army already; now the king is bringing it to Argos, that those at home may have their share.—**ὑμῖν** (*Cod. Farn.*) is an obvious conjecture and may be right, but it is not necessary.

531. **κατείργασται πέδον** *her ground has been broken up.* For the intensive *κατα-* cf. *καταλύω destroy*, '*loose to its atoms*', *κατάγνυμι break to pieces*, *καταίθω burn up*, etc.

532. *Her foundations are undiscoverable and her fixed fabrics of religion, and the seed of her is perishing altogether out of the earth.* **βωμοὶ** in the full sense (see *v.* 395) including *altars* but not these only. We may be reminded that except the religious buildings, a Greek town or fort in the heroic age, and for the most part even till the fifth century, contained little which would not rapidly perish of itself. See the remarks of Thucydides (I. 10) on an imaginary abandonment and decay of Sparta and of Athens, where *τά τε ἱερὰ καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τὰ ἐδάφη* is a prose equivalent for *βωμοὶ καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματα.* — **σπέρμα... χθονός**: lit. 'and the seed of all the land is dying out of it'. *σπέρμα* is metaphorical, not literal. The plant is Troy itself, so destroyed that there is nothing to restore.—**ἐξαπόλλυται χθονός.** Note the tense. The metaphorical conception, not strictly possible but sufficient for poetry, is that of a soil so pulverised that there is left in it nothing capable of growth, and the vegetable fragments can only decay. 'Seeds' could not really be so destroyed, but an olive-yard or a vineyard could. The elaborate devastations of these, practised as a method of war, has perhaps suggested the image. —The whole of this passage is closely imitated from the account of the destruction of Athens by Xerxes (*Pers.* 811 foll.), put by the poet into the mouth of Darius. The ghost of the king continues thus, *τοιγὰρ κακῶς δράσαντες οὐκ ἐλάσσονα πάσχουσι*, words which lend an ominous significance to the herald's boasts in *vv.* 537—538.

τῶν νῦν· Πάρις γὰρ οὔτε συντελὴς πόλις
ἐξεύχεται τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦ πάθους πλέον.
ὀφλὼν γὰρ ἁρπαγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς δίκην
τοῦ ῥυσίου θ' ἥμαρτε καὶ πανώλεθρον
αὐτόχθον' ὃν πατρῷον ἔθρισεν δόμον.
διπλᾶ δ' ἔτισαν Πριαμίδαι θἀμάρτια.
ΧΟ. κῆρυξ Ἀχαιῶν χαῖρε τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ.
ΚΗ. χαίρω· τεθνᾶναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ θεοῖς†.

541. *αὐτόχθονον.*

537—538. **τῶν νῦν· Πάρις γὰρ κτλ.** By the destruction of Troy Agamemnon *is left* the most glorious of men. The ominous effect of these lines (see on *v.* 532) is aided by their ambiguity. The intention is that Agamemnon, having more than avenged his honour upon Troy, has *now* no rival in the world. But it is so worded as rather to suggest that, since Troy has paid in full, it is against her cruel devastator that the balance of sin now lies. For **τίεσθαι** is an indecisive word, limited conventionally to *reward* or *honour*, but easily reverting to its proper sense of *payment*.—**Πάρις γὰρ οὔτε** *i.e.* *οὔτε* Πάρις *οὔτε*. Wecklein suggests *οὐδέ*, *i.e.* *οὐ* Πάρις *οὐδέ*, as in *Cho.* 293, Soph. *Phil.* 771 etc.—**συντελής** literally 'joined with him in payment' or 'liability to payment'. Troy in receiving him adopted his act and has shared his punishment. See *vv.* 405—408. The metaphor suggests a police-custom, such as is common in ancient law, by which a certain society, as a kinship or the inhabitants of a district, is held to payment in property or person for crimes of a member.

539. **ἁρπαγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς** *of rapine as well as theft*, *i.e.* 'theft aggravated by rapine', *ἁρπαγή* meaning violent robbery as contrasted with *κλοπή*, simple stealing. The aggravation naturally increased the penalty and perhaps, under the law or custom to which Aeschylus alludes, also involved the extension of the responsibility.—Wecklein notes that according to Hom. *Il.* 13. 626 Paris carried off other plunder (*κτήματα πολλά*) with Helen.

540. **τοῦ ῥυσίου θ' ἥμαρτε κτλ.** 'he has not only lost the *reprisal*'. **τὸ ῥύσιον** 'what is taken by way of reprisal', *i.e.* the stolen thing itself or an equivalent and something besides by way of satisfaction. This would be the penalty for mere theft. For this sense of *ῥύσιον* see Soph. *Phil.* 958 *θανὼν παρέξω δαῖθ' ὑφ' ὧν ἐφερβόμην...φόνον φόνου δὲ ῥύσιον τίσω τάλας.*—It was also specialised to 'that which is taken as a *pledge*, *ἐνέχυρον*', but that idea is here irrelevant.

ib. **καὶ πανώλεθρον......δόμον** 'but hath also ruined and razed his own father's house, it and the place thereof together'. This penalty is to be understood literally and not merely in the metaphorical sense that the fine would ruin the *συντελεῖς*, the family of the criminal. For a heinous act of rapine, a barbarous custom might well prescribe not only, as a matter of course, the extinction of the robber-family, but also the actual literal destruction of their house.—We need not press the parallel to details or ask what was the *ῥύσιον* in the case of Troy, whether Helen herself or what else. The point is simply to palliate the sacrilegious barbarities exercised upon Troy by a precedent from private law, showing that when the crime is *aggravated*, the penalty may be (1) made very severe and (2) extended beyond the offender. The

not one in the live world. As for Paris and his people, bound with him to payment, they cannot boast a balance of damage done. Sentenced for theft and rapine too, he hath not only lost the reprisal, but also hath ruined and razed his very father's house, it and the place thereof together. Two-fold the loss the sons of Priam have paid.

An Elder. Joy to thee, herald of the coming Achæan host!

Herald. ....

---

custom cited is itself barbarous and antiquated, and the plea would appear to an audience of Aeschylus' day, as the purpose requires, worthless. It is in fact self-condemnatory, for the real object of the sacrilege committed at Troy was *ἁρπαγή* (see *vv.* 350 foll.).—**αὐτόχθον' ὃν** or **αὐτόχθονον** (?). I prefer on the whole Blomfield's reading.—**ὃν** 'his own' is surely not, as Hermann says, superfluous but much to the point.—**αὐτόχθονα**: here 'even to the site on which it stood', literally 'ground and all'; cf. *αὐτόπρεμνος*, *αὐτόρριζος* etc.—For *αὐτόχθονον* Hermann makes the subtle defence that the form *αὐτόχθονος* is used deliberately in order to distinguish this meaning from the common *αὐτόχθων* *indigenous.* But the poet saw, for instance, no such difficulty in *ἄφθονος* *not invidious*, *v.* 477.

541. **διπλᾶ ἔτισαν θἀμάρτια** *they have paid the double of the loss*, another analogy from the law of theft, but from a more humane jurisprudence. The anticlimax is noticeable and betrays the weakness of the plea.—**ἔτισαν θἀμάρτια**: *ἁμάρτιον* seems to occur only here and perhaps in *Pers.* 679 where both reading and interpretation are uncertain. For the rendering *loss* argues here the occurrence of *ἤμαρτε* *lost* just above.—Another interpretation, *τὸν μισθὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, is given by the schol. and would resemble *εὐαγγέλια* *reward for good tidings* (Sidgwick), though *εὐαγγέλια* is a regularly formed *secondary* adjective from *εὐάγγελος*, so that the analogy is imperfect.—The herald, who, it will be observed, has not addressed any one except the gods, stops abruptly and remains absorbed in his feelings till one of the elders addresses him.

543. **τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ** *i.e.* *τῶν στρατευομένων*. The preposition is used in the pregnant manner which may be called regular in Greek: the description of the army itself is coloured by the fact that the herald comes from it.

544. This line is hopeless. *οὐκέτ' ἀντερῶ* (h and its scholia) is probably conjecture; *τεθνᾶναι* (for *τεθνάναι*) is a figment.—As it is hard to see a reason for *θεοῖς*, we may affirm perhaps (with Hermann, Weil) that part of the line was *χαίρω...τεθνάναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ*, and that *θεοῖς* is merely a patch.—The modern restorations seem to assume that *τεθνάναι οὐκ ἀντερῶ* or *οὐκέτ' ἀντερῶ* could mean *I will not refuse to die.* But *τεθνάναι*, though for some purposes interchangeable with *θανεῖν*, should in this connexion give the meaning *I will not deny that I am dead.* This however is not an impossible meaning, for the point may turn on the use of *χαῖρε* (in funerals, epitaphs etc.) as an address *to the dead.* The poets often play with the senses of this word. Thus *e.g.* *χαίρω; τί χαίρω; τὸ τεθνάναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ* (where *χαίρω* is deliberative subjunctive) would mean '*Be glad!* Thou needst not say *be glad.* Though indeed the greeting of the dead suits me well enough', being thus exhausted with past misery and present joy. Both the play on *χαῖρε* and the play on *τεθνάναι* may be illustrated from the farewell scene between Polyxena, going to her death, and Hecuba (Eur. *Hec.* 426 foll.): *Pol.* *χαῖρ'* (*farewell*), *ὦ τεκοῦσα, χαῖρε Κασ-*

ΧΟ. ἔρως πατρῴας τῆσδε γῆς σ' ἐγύμνασεν.
ΚΗ. ὥστ' ἐνδακρύειν γ' ὄμμασιν χαρᾶς ὕπο.
ΧΟ. τερπνῆς ἄρ' ἴστε τῆσδ' ἐπήβολοι νόσου.
ΚΗ. πῶς δή; διδαχθεὶς τοῦδε δεσπόσω λόγου.
ΧΟ. τῶν ἀντερώντων ἱμέρῳ πεπληγμένος.
ΚΗ. ποθεῖν ποθοῦντα τήνδε γῆν στρατὸν λέγεις.
ΧΟ. ὡς πόλλ' ἀμαυρᾶς ἐκ φρενός c' ἀναστένειν.
ΚΗ. πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον; τοῦτ' ἐπῆν στύγος στρατῷ;
ΧΟ. πάλαι τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω.
ΚΗ. καὶ πῶς; ἀπόντων κοιράνων ἔτρεις τινάς;
ΧΟ. ὡς νῦν—τὸ σὸν δὴ—καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.

551. *φρενὸς ἀναστένειν.* 554. *τυράννων.* 555. *ὧν.*

σάνδρα τέ μοι. Hec. χαίρουσιν ἄλλοι, μητρὶ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν τόδε (others may take *comfort*, but not a mother)... *Pol. ζῇ* (Πολύδωρος) *καὶ θανούσης ὄμμα συγκλῄσει τὸ σόν. Hec. τέθνηκ' ἔγωγε πρὶν θανεῖν κακῶν ὕπο.* See also Eur. *Hel.* 286 *τοῖς πράγμασιν τέθνηκα*, id. *Or.* 1028 *ἅλις ἀπ' Ἀργείας χερὸς τέθνηκα* (*I have been tortured*). This, or something like it, would also give its proper sense (*I admit*) to *οὐκ ἀντερῶ*.—It must not however be taken as certain even that *ἀντερῶ* stands for *ἀντερέω*. It may equally stand for *ἀντεράω*, signifying to be jealously in love with death, 'jealous of the buried dead', and the reply rather points to something of this kind.

545. **ἐγύμνασεν** *hath tortured thee*: see *P. V.* 605 *πυρί με φλέξον ἢ χθονὶ κάλυψον,... μηδέ μοι φθονήσῃς εὐγμάτων. ἅδην με πολύπλανοι πλάναι γεγυμνάκασι*, and Soph. *Trach.* 1083.

546. **ἐνδακρύειν**: literally 'weep into it', *i.e.* the earth. The man is still kneeling.

547. *Then learn that it is a sweet anguishing which ye have taken*; because, as they explain, love *returned* is sweet.—**τερπνῆς** predicate.—**τῆσδε νόσου**: *ἔρωτος*.—**ἐπήβολοι**: cf. *v.* 825 *τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον*.—Hermann defends **ἴστε**, taking *ἐπήβολοι* as equivalent to a participle (*ἐπήβολοι ὄντες*): and it is characteristic of Aeschylus to use adjectives participially.—**ἦστε** (*were*, irregular form, Ahrens), *ἦτε* h.

549. **πεπληγμένος.** As this line explains and continues *v.* 547, consistency would require *πεπληγμένοι* (Tyrwhitt). But according to the practical grammar of speech and poetry, as distinguished from logical theory, there is no objection to the singular. From the singular *σε* of *v.* 545 the speaker deflects, without any reason except the caprice of thought, into the plural *ἴστε* of *v.* 547 and then back again to the singular in *v.* 549. Either might have been used throughout indifferently. The re-appearance of the singular gives the feeling a more personal turn. To change it is to stiffen the movement of life. See also next note.

551. 'Aye, and oft sighed for thee from a weary heart'. **φρενός σ'** (Boissonade) is preferable technically and in sense to *φρενός μ'* (Scaliger).—**ἀναστένειν** *to sigh for* (cf. *ἀνακαλεῖν*) is commonly used of the absent or the dead. *Supra* 417 and Eur. *Or.* 156 *ἔτι μὲν ἐμπνέει, βραχὺ δ' ἀναστένει* are among the few examples in tragedy of an intransitive use: in id. *Hec.* 186 *τί με δυσφημεῖς*...

Eld. Hast thou longed for thy native land with a torturing love?

Her. Aye, so that for joy mine eyes weep tears upon it.

Eld. Then learn that 'tis a sweet languishing ye have taken.

Her. How so? I need a lesson to master thy saying.

Eld. As being struck with a passion not unreturned.

Her. Argos, thou sayest, pined for her pining soldiers.

Eld. So pined, as oft to sigh for thee from a weary heart.

Her. Whence this melancholy? Was there yet this distress reserved for us that have fought?

Eld. For long past I have used silence to prevent hurt.

Her. But how so? Wast thou, the kings being away, in fear of some one?

Eld. So much that now, as thou sayest, e'en death were grateful.

τί ποτ' ἀναστένεις; the object (*με*) is continued and the verb means (see the context) *to call as if dead.*—For the interchange of *στρατόν* and *σε*, see previous note.

552. The herald, at first merely puzzled, begins to perceive that something is wrong.—**πόθεν...στρατῷ;** *Whence this melancholy? Was there yet this in reserve to distress us that have fought?*, an exclamation of disappointment, 'Have we come home only to find more trouble here?' For *ἐπεῖναι* 'to be *destined, appointed*' see Hesiod, *Op.* 114 (the subject is mankind in the golden age) *ὥστε θεοὶ δ' ἔζωον ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, | νόσφιν ἄτερ τε πόνων καὶ οἰζύος, οὐδέ τι δειλὸν | γῆρας ἐπῆν* (*no miserable old age awaited them*), *αἰεὶ δὲ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὁμοῖοι | τέρποντ' ἐν θαλίῃσι κτλ.* See also the cognate *ἐφεστάναι* in Hom. *Il.* 12. 322 foll. (if to shun war had been to live ageless and deathless, it would have been well to shun it), *νῦν δ' ἔμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο | μυρίαι, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι, | ἴομεν.*—**στύγος** (cf. *v.* 563) is a further predicate, and upon this rather than upon the verb depends *στρατῷ.*—If this line be taken (so MS.) as one sentence, **στρατῷ** means *the people, i.e.* the Argives *at home*, a use possible in itself but hard to reconcile with this context.—*πόλει* Kennedy; see further Wecklein, Appendix.

553. *I have long used silence to prevent hurt* (*φάρμακον βλάβης* like *ἄκος ὕπνου* in *v.* 17), a reply ambiguous between the senses 'Least said is soonest mended', and 'Things have been so with us that we dared not even speak'. It thus answers, while it avoids, the question *πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον;*

554. **καὶ πῶς;** *In what sense?* See preceding note.—**κοιράνων** h, probably by conjecture. *τυράννων* (f) may have sprung from a gloss.

555. 'So that now, in thine own phrase, I would right gladly even die' (?).—**τὸ σὸν δὴ** alluding to *vv.* 510—512, and, perhaps also to *v.* 544 as it originally stood.—**ὡς** (Scaliger) seems probable. The general sense is fairly clear.—Here the herald, eager to be rid of a disagreeable subject which seems to lead to nothing definite, breaks off into a more congenial theme. One plain word might have saved the king. But the elders cannot make up their minds.

ΚΗ. εὖ γὰρ πέπρακται, ταῦτα δ' ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ.
τὰ μέν τις εὖ λέξειεν εὐπετῶς ἔχειν,
τὰ δ' αὖτε κἀπίμομφα· τίς δὲ πλὴν θεῶν
ἅπαντ' ἀπήμων τὸν δι' αἰῶνος χρόνον;
μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαυλίας,
σπαρνὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους (τί δ' οὐ
στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες ἤματος μέρος;),

556—587. This remarkable speech is irregular throughout, even extremely irregular, but not with the irregularity of accidental defacement. Its aberrations are all such as distinguish popular rhetoric from educated rhetoric, and should be compared with the speeches of the *Nurse* in the *Choephori* (where see notes). We have a man of the people wrought to the highest pitch of emotion, pouring out in a voice half choked with sobs and tears a story which is pathetic just because the misery of it is vulgar and commonplace. We should not expect from him the stateliness of Agamemnon or the subtlety of Clytaemnestra.

556. *Aye, all is well, well with allowance for the time*, literally 'but *that* in a long time'. This is irregular, but precisely analogous to the common use of καὶ ταῦτα 'and that'.—It gives a better point to take these words separately, though if they are attached, as usual, to the next line the meaning is practically the same.

557—559. *A man must speak well of his fortune, though some of it be not so good. Only a god can be without trouble all his time*: literally, 'Let a man praise some things, that they are fortunate, and other things, though objectionable', *i.e.* if he gets good, let him take the worse with it and call it all good together.—**εὖ λέξειεν**: the optative is used as a kind of imperative. In the older language this is common both in general and in particular injunctions, *e.g. Od.* 18. 141 τῷ μήτις ποτὲ πάμπαν ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστιος εἴη, | ἀλλ' ὅγε σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι *I would have a man not be lawless*, *Od.* 4. 735 ἀλλά τις ὀτρηρῶς Δολίον καλέσειε γέροντα, etc. (See Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, § 299; Kühner, *Gr. Gramm.* II. § 395. 7.) It survives in later writers chiefly in maxims, such as this, *v.* 1375, and Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1431 ἔρδοι τις ἣν ἕκαστος εἰδείη τέχνην. In Pindar *Pyth.* 10. 21 θεὸς εἴη ἀπήμων κέαρ *it must be left to a god to have an untroubled heart* we have a construction somewhat similar, and Pindar may be quoting the latter part of the same proverb, which Aeschylus (*vv.* 558—559) here turns in his own language.—**εὖ λέξειεν εὐπετῶς ἔχειν**: literally 'say in their praise that they are fortunate'; cf. *v.* 452 εὖ λέγοντες τὸν μὲν ὡς μάχης ἴδρις (ἐστίν).—**εὖ...εὐπετῶς**. The assonance of εὖ is a favourite with the Attic poets, occurring not only where the word is repeated in exactly the same sense (as in *v.* 505, and *Supp.* 225 εὖ τ' ἔπεμψεν εὖ τε δεξάσθω), but also where the sense is only imperfectly parallel, as here and in *Eum.* 869 εὖ δρῶσαν εὖ πάσχουσαν εὖ τιμωμένην, and even where it is not parallel at all, as in Soph. *Trach.* 296 ὅμως δ' ἔνεστι τοῖσιν εὖ σκοπουμένοις ταρβεῖν τὸν εὖ πράσσοντα μὴ σφαλῇ ποτε.—**ἂν λέξειεν** Auratus.

560—572. The gist of this long period is this, 'We have suffered much, but all's well that ends well'. Paraphrased in logical form, it might run thus: 'For if I were to reckon all our miseries and privations, whether in the ships (560—562), both by night (560—561) and by day (561—562), or on land (563—567), where the neighbourhood of the enemy

Her. Yes, we have done well every way, well, for the length of time. A man must speak well of his fortune, though part be not so good. Only a god can be without trouble all his time. For were I to count our sufferings in bad quarters, the narrow and comfortless berths (and in the day-time miserable for want of

---

aggravated (563—564) the pains of exposure to the damps of the ground and the air (565—567), if I counted up our various distresses from extreme cold to extreme heat (568—571), [*it would make a heavy total: but*] why complain of what is past (572)?' etc. But the hypothetical clause loses itself in parentheses and ejaculations, starting again more or less in its track at *v.* 568, and the answering clause disappears altogether in the abrupt transition at *v.* 571.

560. **δυσαυλίας** *bad quarters* for sleeping; see *αὐλίζεσθαι*. He divides these under the heads of 'ship-quarters' and 'land-quarters', marking this by the antithesis *τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ*. The ships, drawn up on shore and protected by a rampart, formed part of the camp. It is of this use that he speaks as well as of the voyage.

561. The miseries of the ships are again divided into 'night' and 'day', night appearing in *κακοστρώτους* (*uncomfortable as beds*) and day being thrown in parenthetically.—**παρήξεις** (?): apparently something like 'berths', from *παρήκειν to pass into* (?). The interpretation of the scholia *παραδρομαί* (*passages*) does not seem to suit the context.—**παρίξεις** (Wecklein) is a better form.

ib. **τί δ' οὐ...μέρος**; Two questions must be distinguished: (1) the construction irrespective of the case of the participles, (2) the nominative case. Irrespective of the case, if, that is, we assume the reading *στένοντας οὐ λαχόντας*, there is no difficulty: the context supplies both *εἰ λέγοιμι* and the pronoun *ἡμᾶς*, and the translation is 'while in the day-time we had—every privation to lament'. The negatives, as Wellauer perceived, are not parallel, nor are the participles. **τί οὐ**; stands as usual for *πᾶν*, and the rest of the sentence is constructed exactly as if *πᾶν* were written. **οὐ λαχόντες** is literally 'not having got' *i.e.* 'being without' as in Eur. *Andr.* 385 *λαχοῦσά τ' ἄθλια καὶ μὴ λαχοῦσα δυστυχὴς καθίσταμαι with what is offered I must be miserable and without it unhappy.* For the use of the negative term where English would prefer a positive (*privation*) see Demosth. 19. 77 *μὴ οὖν...ὧν ὑμᾶς οὗτος ἐξηπάτησε μὴ δότω δίκην Let him not escape punishment for the deceptions practised on you.* The accusative *τί οὐ* (*i.e. πᾶν*) depends not upon *στένοντες* but upon *οὐ λαχόντες*. For the order of the words see *P. V.* 601 *τί ποτε ταῖσδ' ἐνέζευξας εὑρὼν ἁμαρτοῦσαν ἐν πημοναῖς; Of what sin didst thou convict her* (*τί-ἁμαρτοῦσαν εὑρών*) *that thou hast reduced her to this misery?* Thus *τί-οὐ στένοντες οὐ-λαχόντες* stands for *πάντων στένοντες ἀτυχήσαντες bewailing the privation of everything.* Doubtless a disciplined stylist could not have used so uncouth a form of words, but neither would he have spoken any one of the sentences justly and artistically placed in this speech. Lastly in **ἤματος μέρος** the accusative is perhaps that of *duration* (like *βίον* in *v.* 1141), and the genitive *ἤματος* is not partitive but the adjectival genitive 'of equivalent' as in Eur. *Med.* 430 *ἁμετέραν ἀνδρῶν τε μοῖραν* 'our (*i.e.* the female) division [of mankind] and the male'. So *ἤματος μέρος* is 'the diurnal portion' of time (*vv.* 556, 559), and is contrasted with *νυκτὸς μέρος* 'the nocturnal portion', implied but not expressed in what precedes, as *τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ* is contrasted with the unexpressed *τὰ μὲν ἐν ναυσίν*.—Mr W. R. Paton (*Class. Review*, Vol. VII. p. 150) citing Plutarch *de Defectu Oraculorum*, p. 414 A, takes **ἤμα-**

τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ (καὶ προσῆν πλέον στύγος,
εὐναὶ γὰρ ἦσαν δηίων πρὸς τείχεσιν)—
ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ κἀπὸ γῆς λειμώνιαι
δρόσοι κατεψέκαζον, ἔμπεδον σίνος
ἐσθημάτων, τιθέντες ἔνθηρον τρίχα—
χειμῶνα δ' εἰ λέγοι τις οἰωνοκτόνον,
οἷον παρεῖχ' ἄφερτον Ἰδαία χιών,
ἢ θάλπος, εὖτε πόντος ἐν μεσημβριναῖς
κοίταις ἀκύμων νηνέμοις εὕδοι πεσών,—
τί ταῦτα πενθεῖν δεῖ; παροίχεται πόνος·
παροίχεται δὲ τοῖσι μὲν τεθνηκόσιν
τὸ μήποτ' αὖθις μηδ' ἀναστῆναι μέλειν
(τί τοὺς ἀναλωθέντας ἐν ψήφῳ λέγειν

τος μέρος as '(it is) the work (portion) of a day' or 'a day's work', the apodosis to **εἰ λέγοιμι.** This seems more than possible, but would leave **τί...λαχόντες** more abrupt than ever; see Mr Paton's further remarks.—There remains the deferred question as to the nominative case in the participles. The English editors mostly retain it, Paley adding boldly and truly that it is "used without regard to any regular construction". For a special purpose, artistic speech follows real speech and defies grammatical analysis. It is an extreme case of construction 'according to the sense'. The soldiers, as subject of the sufferings, are thought in the nominative, if we may so express it, throughout: the whole period, if reduced to symmetry, could naturally be turned so as to have *ἡμεῖς* for the general subject, thus: *εἰ λέγοιμι ὅσα ἐμοχθοῦμεν ἔν τε ταῖς ναυσὶν αὐλιζόμενοι, στρώματα ἔχοντες οὐχ ἱκανά, ἐπί τε τῇ γῇ ἔτι δεινότερα, ὡς πρὸς τῇ πόλει στρατοπεδευόμενοι, κτλ.* Therefore, in the one place in which the soldiers are mentioned, the appropriate nominative is put in simply *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, and we have a specimen, perhaps unique, of Greek as it was actually talked.

563. **τὰ δ' αὖτε χέρσῳ**: supply *εἰ λέγοιμι.*—**καὶ προσῆν...τείχεσιν**: a parenthesis, such as in a more regular style would be expressed by a relative clause, 'where there was the additional distress of constant danger from the neighbouring enemy'.

565. **ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ κτλ.** We go back to *τὰ χέρσῳ.*

565—567. Another clause radically inaccurate in logic and grammar, though perfectly intelligible. The remark of Schneidewin on the masculine *τιθέντες*, that it relates in the speaker's mind to *ὄμβροι* (*rain*), is true, but only part of the truth: *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* relates to this same *ὄμβροι*, and so does *κατεψέκαζον* (*drizzled down*), and the whole sentence, except the words *κἀπὸ γῆς λειμώνιαι δρόσοι.* The rain is from first to last the subject in the mind, and the sentence would have run regularly thus, *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ ὄμβροι κατεψέκαζον κτλ.* But the words *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* suggest by antithesis 'the dew from the earth', which is thereupon thrust in interjectionally; and after this, the subject *ὄμβροι* being by the antithesis sufficiently given to thought, the sentence proceeds without it, literally thus, 'from the sky (and off the earth marsh-dew too) it drizzled down' etc. In such a fashion

everything), and other miseries by land (and there it was worse, our camp being close to the enemy's wall), how the sky rained, and the dews from the marshy ground, ever rotting our garments and breeding foul life upon us: or were one to count the winter's cold, made so intolerable by the snows of Ida that the birds fell dead, or the heat, when in his noon-day rest the sea sank windless and waveless to sleep—but what need to grieve for these things? The pain is past; so past for the dead, that they care not so much as to rise up any more. Ah why should we count the number of the slain, when the living suffer by

---

mutatis mutandis men frequently speak in every language, but do not generally write.

566. **ἔμπεδον σίνος ἐσθημάτων.** The rotting of the dress from constant wetting is mentioned not so much for itself, as for the horrible diseases to which it leads and which are specified more particularly in the next words. **τιθέντες ἔνθηρον τρίχα** *putting evil life into the hair*, or in plain words 'breeding vermin'. As in Soph. *Phil.* 698 (*ἔνθηρος πούς envenomed foot*) *ἔνθηρος* is a poetic equivalent for the medical term *τεθηριωμένος* (see L. and Sc. *s. vv.*), so here it represents the same term in another sense (see L. and Sc. *s. vv. θηριόω, ζωόω*). The *θρίξ* is the hair of the whole body, not merely of the head and face.—The interpretation 'shaggy, beast-like' (1) does not satisfy the formation, and (2) is here out of place. The man is speaking of real, not fanciful, miseries. As to the dignity of tragedy, Aeschylus treats it on proper occasions with perfect indifference, and lets his soldier describe the torments of the camp, as his nurse the plagues of the nursery (*Cho.* 753), for what they are, without attempting to conceal what it is his very purpose to express.

568—572. See above on *v.* 560.

572. The abruptness of these exclamations is aided by the rhythm, the punctuation acting against the caesura.

573. **τοῖσι μέν**: to this irregularly answers *ἡμῖν δὲ...νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος*, *v.* 578, *quasi παροίχεται δ' ἡμῖν ὥστε νικᾶν τὸ κέρδος.* The trouble is over for all, for the dead completely, for the living, in that they can balance against it their triumph.

574. **τὸ...μέλειν** *so that they care*, or *in the sense that they care*, grammatically an 'accusative in apposition to the verbal action' of *παροίχεται.* That 'they care not' and that 'the trouble is over' are two aspects of the same fact.

575—577. Another parenthesis. The dead have their gain, and perhaps an advantage over the living.—*Why should we count up the number of the slain, when the living must suffer the persistence of fortune's cruelty?* The two clauses are correlative and make up one conception between them. In English we indicate such a relation by making one clause dependent. The point is that the inevitable pain of the living is inconsistent with the lamenting of the dead or, as it is put, with the counting of the number of them: and the question *τί χρή;* protests against the unreasonableness of the two things taken together.—**τύχης παλιγκότου** literally 'from fortune being persistently cruel', gen. absolute. *παλιγκότου* has its full signification (see L. and Sc. *s. v.*). Fortune is the harassing disease from which we escape by death. The living *ἀλγεῖ*, because such is the law of fate; the question is why, this being so, we should ask 'how many are dead?' and not rather 'how many are living to feel?'

τὸν ζῶντα δ' ἀλγεῖν χρὴ τύχης παλιγκότου;
καὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν συμφοραῖς καταξιῶ)·
ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖσιν Ἀργείων στρατοῦ
νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρέπει·
ὡς κομπάσαι τῷδ' εἰκὸς ἡλίου φάει
ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης καὶ χθονὸς ποτωμένοις,
"Τροίην ἑλόντες δήποτ' Ἀργείων στόλος
θεοῖς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα
δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν ἀρχαῖον γάνος".
τοιαῦτα χρὴ κλύοντας εὐλογεῖν πόλιν
καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς· καὶ χάρις τιμήσεται
Διὸς τάδ' ἐκπράξασα. πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον.

ΧΟ. νικώμενος λόγοισιν οὐκ ἀναίνομαι.
ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡβᾷ τοῖς γέρουσιν εὖ μαθεῖν.
δόμοις δὲ ταῦτα καὶ Κλυταιμήστρᾳ μέλειν
εἰκὸς μάλιστα, σὺν δὲ πλουτίζειν ἐμέ.

590. Κλυταιμνήστρα.

---

577. *To have done with chance is itself, methinks, right acceptable.* **πολλὰ χαίρειν συμφοραῖς**, literally 'to receive the dismissal of chance', πολλὰ χαίρω being the passive corresponding to the formula of dismissal πολλὰ χαῖρε or πολλὰ χαίρειν λέγω *I dismiss, will have no more to do with*: cf. Soph. *O. T.* 596 νῦν πᾶσι χαίρω *now all wish me joy.* What is said there by Prof. Jebb, that "the phrase has been suggested by χαῖρέ μοι, but refers rather to the meaning than to the form of the greeting", is true here also; 'to be dismissed *to happiness*' is the meaning in full.—**καταξιῶ** *I hold acceptable*, like ἀξιῶ *I do not refuse* (Soph. *O. T.* 944), only stronger. It is the opposite of ἀπαξιῶ *I reject.* See *Theb.* 654.—**καὶ** *also*: those who live are happy in one way, χαίρουσι συμφοραῖς in one sense, but the dead, who πολλὰ χαίρουσι, are happy *too*.—**συμφοραῖς**. The interpretation 'I bid fortune begone' is possible only if we read, with Blomfield, συμφορὰς, and would rather require κελεύω.

578. 'And we that remain, though we have suffered more and longer than the dead and have not received their complete discharge, may still rejoice on the whole, when we consider the everlasting and world-wide glory which redounds to our city'.

580—587. These lines are difficult and, if correct, must have been explained by something conventional in the connotation of the language. For a discussion of the details, see Appendix N.—**ὡς** causal, *since, considering how*, as in *Theb.* 351 δμωΐδες δὲ καινοπήμονες, ὡς ἐλπὶς ἔς τι νύκτερον τέλος μολεῖν.—**κομπάσαι**, as the style and honours of a person might be announced before him.—**τῷδε**: for the dative with εἰκός, which is comparatively rare, cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 40 πάντα γὰρ δι' ἀρσένων γυναιξὶ πράσσειν εἰκός.—**ποτωμένοις**, if correct, agrees with the dative ἡμῖν

fortune's persistency? A full release from chance is also, say I, something worth. And for us who are left of the Argive host, the gain on the balance overweighs the hurt, seeing that yon bright sun may proclaim in our honour, winging our fame over land and sea, 'Troy in old time was won by an Argive armament: and these are the spoils which, to the glory of the gods throughout Hellas, they nailed upon the temples for a monumental pride'. Hearing this, men must needs praise Argos and them that led her host; and the grace of Zeus that wrought it all shall be paid with thanks. And so I have said my say.

Eld. Defeat in argument I do not deny. To be teachable is a thing that ages not with age. But the household and Clytaemnestra, whom this news should most nearly interest, must share the gain with me.

---

supplied from *v.* 578 and constructed as a dative of 'the person interested', literally 'may proclaim for us flying'. For the metaphor cf. Pind. *Nem.* 6. 50 *πέταται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσας τηλόθεν ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν*. Here by a bolder figure the subject of the fame is said to 'fly abroad' as the fame is spread, a stretch of language which may be illustrated from Pindar *Isthm.* 3. 28 *ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις* 'by their high feats of valour they have reached from home to the ends of the world', *i.e.* their renown has gone so far (and Theognis 237 *σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἔδωκα σὺν οἷς ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον πωτήσῃ καὶ γῆν* Wecklein).—**Τροίην κτλ.** Offerings from the spoil would be dedicated in places of religion with inscriptions, of which the sense is here paraphrased, naming the dedicators and the occasion. These the sun will proclaim, that is to say, they will be read with each returning day, as those on the palace are now legible in the light of this present morning. Thus the name of Argos will 'fly over land and sea' to the end of time.—**Τροίην**: the archaic (Ionic) form may be intentional in the language of an 'ancient' inscription. See on *Theb.* 259, 447, 519, 590.—**δήποτε** (*aliquando*) may mean either 'at last' or 'formerly' as Paley says. The last seems the better.—**ἀρχαῖον γάνος** literally 'an ancient pride'; the praise is worded as it will be spoken a long time hereafter.—**πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον** a formula of conclusion, indicating here that the thesis *εὖ πέπρακται* (*v.* 556) is made out. The elders assent.—See further Appendix N.

588. **νικώμενος λόγοισιν.** The eloquent proof of the herald that 'all is well' has of course not really touched *τὸ δύσφρον* (*v.* 552), which he does not understand; but this is not the moment to explain, as Clytaemnestra is seen approaching.—The words and context require us to refer *νικώμενος λόγοισιν* to the argument of the herald, not to the proof of the victory, though this may also be in the speaker's mind.

589. 'The capacity for learning is not one of the faculties which is lost with age'. **εὖ μαθεῖν** *docility* (cf. *εὐμαθής*) is the subject of *ἡβᾷ*.—**τοῖς γέρουσιν** *for*, as we should say *in, the old.*—*ἥβη* (*ἐστὶ*) *τοῖς γέρουσιν* (Margoliouth).

591. **σὺν δὲ πλουτίζειν ἐμέ** *and my gain should be shared with them*, literally 'and it (the tale, *ταῦτα*) ought (*εἰκός*) to enrich me *with them* (and not alone)'. The emphasis is on *σύν* and the clause

ΚΛ. ἀνωλόλυξα μὲν πάλαι χαρᾶς ὕπο,
ὅτ' ἦλθ' ὁ πρῶτος νύχιος ἄγγελος πυρός,
φράζων ἅλωσιν Ἰλίου τ' ἀνάστασιν.
καί τίς μ' ἐνίπτων εἶπε· "φρυκτωρῶν δία
πεισθεῖσα Τροίαν νῦν πεπορθῆσθαι δοκεῖς;
ἦ κάρτα πρὸς γυναικὸς αἴρεσθαι κέαρ".
λόγοις τοιούτοις πλαγκτὸς οὖσ' ἐφαινόμην.
ὅμως δ' ἔθυον· καὶ γυναικείῳ νόμῳ
ὀλολυγμὸν ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν κατὰ πτόλιν
ἔλασκον εὐφημοῦντες ἐν θεῶν ἕδραις
θυηφάγον κοιμῶντες εὐώδη φλόγα.
καὶ νῦν τὰ μάσσω μὲν τί δεῖ σ' ἐμοὶ λέγειν;
ἄνακτος αὐτοῦ πάντα πεύσομαι λόγον.
ὅπως δ' ἄριστα τὸν ἐμὸν αἰδοῖον πόσιν
σπεύσω πάλιν μολόντα δέξασθαι (τί γὰρ
γυναικὶ τούτου φέγγος ἥδιον δρακεῖν,
ἀπὸ στρατείας ἄνδρα σώσαντος θεοῦ
πύλας ἀνοῖξαι;), ταῦτ' ἀπάγγειλον πόσει·

595. ἐνίπτων. 601. ἐνθέων.

---

equivalent to πλουτίζειν μὴ μόνον ἐμέ.—There is a certain irony in this language. Not knowing the situation, the elders suppose that the herald's news, if welcome to the queen, cannot be altogether welcome.

592. On the situation here, and on the queen's language, see the Introduction.—**ἀνωλόλυξα μέν.** The antithesis to this does not follow regularly but is substantially given in *καὶ νῦν v.* 603. 'This is not the moment either for exultation (592—602) or for further enquiry (603)'.

594. **Ἰλίου τ' ἀνάστασιν.** Observe that this phrase, thrown in as it were carelessly, utterly changes the character of the supposed beacon-message. As it was represented to the elders above, it reported the 'taking' but did not and could not possibly, under the supposed circumstances, report the 'destruction' of Troy, which had not occurred and, if Clytaemnestra spoke honestly (*v.* 353), was not to be expected or desired. But it is of vital moment that the herald should not catch a glimpse of the supposed 'beacon-system'. Nor can he from what the queen here says, simple and frank though it seems to be. It implies what he must already suppose, that the beacon had signalled the arrival of himself and his companions, and this is in fact the truth. On the other hand the fact that the queen refers to the beacon is enough to convince the elders that, however absurd her notion may be, there is no trick in it.

595. **τις**: *i.e.* the elders in *vv.* 481 foll., whose language she quotes almost *verbatim*, though she was not then pre-

[*Enter* CLYTAEMNESTRA *attended.*]

Clytaemnestra. My joy was uttered some while ago, when the first fiery messenger came in the night, telling that Ilium was taken...and destroyed. Then there were some who found fault with me, and said, 'Art thou for a beacon persuaded to think that Troy is taken now? How like a woman's heart to fly up so high!' Thus they argued, proving my error. But for all that I would sacrifice; and by womanly ordinance the country-folk one and all took up the loud cry of holy gladness, and in the sacred temples stilled with feeding incense the fragrant flame.

And now, for the fuller tale, what need I to take it from thee? From the king himself I shall learn it all. Rather, that I may bring my revered lord with swift return to my loving reception—what light more sweet to the eyes of a wife than this, when she opens the gate to her husband, restored by heaven safe from war?—take thou back to my lord this message: let

---

sent. This however and the arrival of the herald have been reported to her from time to time by those in her interest, as on the stage would be manifest. Plainly she dares not at this crisis lose sight of the elders for a moment; nor is she unwilling to give them a hint that her eye is upon them. The hint is not lost, for when she retires, their language (*v.* 620) is more guarded and unintelligible than ever.—See further the Introduction.

598. **ἐφαινόμην**: 'they tried to prove me deluded' is the signification of the tense.

600. **γυναικείῳ νόμῳ** *with the woman's ritual.*—**ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν** *one after another*, masculine (although the ὀλολυγμός or sacrificial cry was actually uttered by women, as the text declares), because it is the behaviour of the people, not of the women in particular, which is in view. Cf. *Theb.* 253 ἐμῶν ἀκούσασ' εὐγμάτων ἔπειτα σὺ (the maidens of the chorus) ὀλολυγμὸν...παιάνισον.—"Perhaps she is keeping up her satire, 'like women, as you would say, the whole city joined in the cry'" (Sidgwick).—γυναικεῖοι νόμοι (Wecklein) gives a simpler construction.—**νόμῳ**. Cf. νόμισμα *Theb. l.c.*—**πτόλιν**: the Argolid, not 'city' in the modern sense.

602. **κοιμῶντες** *quieting*, *i.e.* piling the incense upon it so that it burned unseen within the heap, instead of blazing. The flame is compared to a creature crying for food till it is stilled.

603. **τὰ μάσσω** *the fuller story.*—**σ' ἐμοί.** Both pronouns are emphatic.

605. **ὅπως...δέξασθαι** *that I may bring my revered spouse with swift return unto my loving reception*, literally 'that I may hasten the kind receiving of him returned'. As often (cf. *v.* 487, *v.* 611, *v.* 970) the Greek puts what is principal in the sentence into the participle, not the verb, and it is μολόντα, not δέξασθαι, which is mainly affected by σπεύσω.—Not 'that I may *hasten to welcome* him'; see *vv.* 609—610.—**ἄριστα** *with all kindness*, the superlative of εὖ *kindly*, belongs to δέξασθαι: cf. *Supp.* 225 εὖ τ' ἔπεμψεν εὖ τε δεξάσθω.

ἥκειν ὅπως τάχιστ' ἐράσμιον πόλει,
γυναῖκα πιστὴν δ' ἐν δόμοις εὕροι μολών,
οἵανπερ οὖν ἔλειπε, δωμάτων κύνα
ἐσθλὴν ἐκείνῳ, πολεμίαν τοῖς δύσφροσιν,
καὶ τἄλλ' ὁμοίαν πάντα, σημαντήριον
οὐδὲν διαφθείρασαν ἐν μήκει χρόνου.
οὐδ' οἶδα τέρψιν οὐδ' ἐπίψογον φάτιν
ἄλλου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς μᾶλλον ἢ χαλκοῦ βαφάς.
ΧΟ. β'. τοιόσδ' ὁ κόμπος. τῆς ἀληθείας γέμων,
οὐκ αἰσχρὸς ὡς γυναικὶ γενναίᾳ λακεῖν.
ΧΟ. αὕτη μὲν οὕτως εἶπε μανθάνοντί σοι
τοροῖσιν ἑρμηνεῦσιν εὐπρεπῶς λόγον.
σὺ δ' εἰπέ, κῆρυξ—Μενέλεων δὲ πεύθομαι—

610—611. **ἥκειν...εὕροι**: the construction varies from the oblique to the direct.—**ἐράσμιον πόλει...γυναῖκα πιστὴν δέ**: these are antithetical in meaning though not exactly in form. 'Let him come swiftly to find his people loving and his wife faithful' is the sense. It is this antithetic emphasis on *πιστὴν* which justifies the position of *δέ*.—**εὕροι μολών**: see on *v.* 605.—**πιστὴν...οἵανπερ οὖν ἔλειπε**: 'faithful to him as he left her' is the sense to the ear, 'faithful to the revenge which she has meditated ever since' the sense to Clytaemnestra's thought. The ambiguity runs all through the following lines, *ἐκείνῳ*, *τοῖς δύσφροσιν* etc.

614. **σημαντήριον οὐδὲν διαφθείρασαν** *having never broken seal at all in this long while, i.e.* 'having guarded his property and honour', or to herself 'still keeping my resolution, as it were a covenant'. For the association of the word *διαφθείρω* with this secondary sense see *v.* 923.—*σημαντήριον* is properly an adjectival form, meaning 'anything in the nature of a seal (*σημαντήρ*)'. There is no reference to literal 'seals'. Such seals would naturally be used in the house (Paley cites Eur. *Orest.* 1108), and naturally also it was guarded by dogs: hence the metaphors: but it is not of these things that Clytaemnestra is thinking or speaking: *σφραγῖδα τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα εὐνῆς* says the schol. correctly.—Still fearing not to be understood she speaks more clearly. – chastity belt?

616. These declarations, which are full of suspicion and peril, are forced upon her by the necessity of the situation. It is an obvious fear that the king may know too much, or before he reaches the fortress may learn too much, for Clytaemnestra's purpose. She thinks it safer therefore to accept the position of one accused and to take the line of defying slander, in the hope that this may be sufficient for the necessary moment.

616—617. **τέρψιν...ἀνδρὸς** *I know of pleasure or of scandalous address from any other man no more than* etc. For *φάτις* in the sense of *speech* or *converse* see Soph. *Phil.* 1045 *βαρεῖαν φάτιν τήνδ' εἶπε*, id. *El.* 329, 1213 (L. and Sc. *s.v.*). She is so far from sin that she has let no man speak to her unbecomingly. **φάτιν** is parallel to *τέρψιν*, and both words are related in the same way to *ἄλλου πρὸς ἀνδρός*.—**ἐπίψογον** 'liable to reproach', cf. *ἐπίμομφος*, *ἐπικίνδυνος*.—*φάτις* may also be taken in the common sense of *rumour*,

him come with all speed to the people that love him, come to find in his home the wife faithful, even such as he left her, a very house-dog, loyal to one, and an enemy to his foes; aye, and in all else unchanged, having never broken seal at all in this long while. I know of pleasure or scandalous address from any other no more than of dyeing bronze. [*Exit.*

A Conspirator. Self-praise like this, filled full with its truth, it doth not misbeseem a noble wife to sound.

An Elder. What she hath said looks well, if by their plain interpretation thou readest it.

But herald, say thou—I would know of Menelaus, our well-

---

report, with the translation 'scandal *arising from*' *i.e.* 'connected with' another; but this does not so well satisfy πρός and the form of the sentence. The hint given to the ear by the parallelism of τέρψιν οὐδὲ...φάτιν would sufficiently explain an exceptional use of the word.

617. **χαλκοῦ βαφάς** *dipping*, *i.e. dyeing*, *of bronze*, an unknown mystery. Probably the expression referred to some artistic secret (Blomfield). Others suppose it to mean merely 'an impossibility'. The sinister suggestiveness which it takes from metaphors such as ἔβαψας ἔγχος *thou hast dipped thy sword* Soph. *Ai.* 95, γυνὴ ἐν σφαγαῖσι βάψασα ξίφος *P. V.* 889, has possibly influenced the poet (Wellauer) but must not be pressed. Between ξίφος and χαλκός there is for this purpose a wide difference.—Here Clytaemnestra, having so far as possible secured the silence of the elders and the prompt departure of the herald, retires as if to make her preparations.

618—621. Here again (see *v.* 363) is a passage defying arrangement or explanation with the traditional list of *dramatis personae*. The MS. gives *vv.* 618—19 to the herald, Hermann transfers them to Clytaemnestra. Whichever be adopted, it is impossible to give any legitimate sense to **ἑρμηνεῦσιν** in *v.* 621. Where are the *commentators* on the queen's address, the *interpreters* of it, to whom the elders refer? The ἑρμηνεῖς are the speakers of *vv.* 618—19, who eke out the queen's suspicious exculpation with an approving comment which it very much needs. In fact the Second Chorus, supporting their spokesman, here act a part precisely similar to that in *vv.* 363 foll. They play to the character which the queen assumes. The elders confine themselves to the dry remark that with this interpretation the herald no doubt comprehends.—**τοιόσδε** (ὤν): 'when it is like this', *i.e.* 'being the natural overflow of genuine feeling'. Self-praise is unseemly in itself; that a wife should praise herself in the language of Clytaemnestra is suspicious in itself; but as she did so (evidently) only under the overpowering desire to assure the king of her devotion, it is not unseemly or suspicious in her.—**οὕτως** *as she has.*—**μανθάνοντι ...εὐπρεπῶς** *speciously if you understand what has been said by their clear interpretation.* **σοι** depends on εὐπρεπῶς, **ἑρμηνεῦσιν** (instrumental) on μανθάνοντι.—See on this passage Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XVII. 242.

622. **σὺ δ' εἰπέ, κῆρυξ.** They detain him, as he turns to go. He is unwilling to be questioned, having only bad news to tell. Seeing this, they add hastily 'But I would know about *Menelaus*', and then more pressingly 'just (γε) whether he is with you'.

εἰ νόστιμός γε καὶ σεσωσμένος πάλιν
ἥξει σὺν ὑμῖν, τῆσδε γῆς φίλον κράτος.
ΚΗ. οὐκ ἔσθ᾽ ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῆ καλὰ
ἐς τὸν πολὺν φίλοισι καρποῦσθαι χρόνον.
ΧΟ. πῶς δῆτ᾽ ἂν εἰπὼν κεδνὰ τἀληθῆ τύχοις;
σχισθέντα δ᾽ οὐκ εὔκρυπτα γίγνεται τάδε.
ΚΗ. ἀνὴρ ἄφαντος ἐξ Ἀχαιικοῦ στρατοῦ,
αὐτός τε καὶ τὸ πλοῖον. οὐ ψευδῆ λέγω.
ΧΟ. β΄. πότερον ἀναχθεὶς ἐμφανῶς ἐξ Ἰλίου,
ἢ χεῖμα, κοινὸν ἄχθος, ἥρπασε στρατοῦ;
ΚΗ. ἔκυρσας ὥστε τοξότης ἄκρος σκοποῦ·
μακρὸν δὲ πῆμα συντόμως ἐφημίσω.
ΧΟ. πότερα γὰρ αὐτοῦ ζῶντος ἢ τεθνηκότος
φάτις πρὸς ἄλλων ναυτίλων ἐκλῄζετο;
ΚΗ. οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδεὶς ὥστ᾽ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τορῶς,
πλὴν τοῦ τρέφοντος Ἡλίου χθονὸς φύσιν.
ΧΟ. πῶς γὰρ λέγεις χειμῶνα ναυτικῷ στρατῷ
ἐλθεῖν τελευτῆσαί τε δαιμόνων κότῳ;
ΚΗ. εὔφημον ἦμαρ οὐ πρέπει κακαγγέλῳ
γλώσσῃ μιαίνειν· χωρὶς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν.
ὅταν δ᾽ ἀπευκτὰ πήματ᾽ ἄγγελος πόλει
στυγνῷ προσώπῳ πτωσίμου στρατοῦ φέρῃ,

627. τύχῃς. 629. ἀνὴρ.

---

625. 'I could not tell false tidings to seem fair', **καλὰ** being predicative.—**λέξαιμι** 'remote deliberative optative', a variation from the deliberative subjunctive found in interrogative sentences both direct, as Ar. *Plut.* 438 ποῖ τις φύγοι; and indirect, as this and Eur. *Alc.* 52 ἔστ᾽ οὖν ὅπως Ἄλκηστις εἰς γῆρας μόλοι; "The difficulty is, not why ἂν is omitted, for the sentences are not conditional, but why the *remote* form (optative) is used instead of the primary form (subjunctive) when the sentences are all of a *primary* character. The answer is that the optative expresses the remoteness, not as usual of *pastness*, but of possibility: the instinct is to express by the optative something *more out of the question* than the subjunctive would have expressed. Thus in Ar. *Plut.* 438 ποῖ φύγῃ would be in ordinary circumstances the expression:...but φύγοι, the MS. reading,...is the exclamation of supreme terror, treating escape as in the last degree unlikely" (Sidgwick).

626. **καρποῦσθαι**, literally 'so as for them to enjoy it'. He would spare them pain, if the truth could be long concealed.

loved king,—this only, whether he hath returned safe and will arrive with you.

Her. It were impossible, if I told a false tale fair, that unto long time your love should enjoy it still!

Eld. Oh, that thy true tale might be happily told! 'Tis not easy to hide, when good and true are parted.

Her. The prince is gone from the Achæan host, himself and his ship also. It is the truth.

A Conspirator. Did he put forth in your sight from Ilium? Or was he snatched from the rest by a storm which fell upon all?

Her. Thou hast, like a master bowman, hit the mark, and put a length of trouble in a brief phrase.

Eld. What then of the prince? Did the general rumour of the voyagers declare him living or dead?

Her. None can tell that for certain, save one only, the Sun that sustaineth life over all the earth.

Eld. And what from first to last was the story of the storm, thus sent on the fleet by angry gods?

Her. A day sacred to joy should not be fouled by the tongue of evil tidings. Religion sunders the two. When one with sad countenance brings to a people heavy tidings of an army fallen,

---

627. **τύχοις** Porson. 'Would that thou couldst speak truth to be good!' *i.e.* 'would that thy news could be both pleasing and true!' The form of expression imitates (Klausen, Kennedy) that of the herald's speech preceding.—**ἄν εἰπὼν τύχοις** properly 'be so happy as to speak'.

629. **ἀνὴρ** Hermann.

631—632. Best assigned to the speaker of *vv.* 618—619. The herald is surprised, as well he may be, at the rapidity with which the questioner, out of all the possibilities, lights upon the exact truth. But in truth this questioner has the same knowledge of the facts which Clytaemnestra exhibits before the Herald's arrival (*vv.* 350 foll.), and his question is put merely in the hope of cutting the dangerous conversation short.—**ἐμφανῶς** *visibly*, *i.e.* so that it was known when he went, as contrasted with the *unperceived* disappearance in a storm.

635. **αὐτοῦ** Menelaus himself, as opposed to the ἄλλοι. They suppose that something may have been heard of Menelaus' ship, and ask what was the latest news of *the prince*.

638. **φύσιν** in the full sense of the word (*ὅτι φύεται*) 'all that groweth on earth,' *i.e.* all life.

640. **δαιμόνων**: the gods of Troy presumably; see *v.* 350.

642. **χωρὶς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν** *the functions belong to different gods*, literally 'the religious province (*τιμὴ θεῶν*) is distinct in the two cases', the one belonging to joyous or friendly gods, the other to gloomy or adverse gods. Not 'the worship of the gods is to be kept dis-

πόλει μὲν ἕλκος ἓν τὸ δήμιον τυχεῖν,
πολλοὺς δὲ πολλῶν ἐξαγισθέντας δόμων
ἄνδρας διπλῇ μάστιγι, τὴν Ἄρης φιλεῖ,
δίλογχον ἄτην, φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα,
τοιῶνδε μέν τοι πημάτων σεσαγμένον
πρέπει λέγειν παιᾶνα τόνδ' Ἐρινύων·
σωτηρίων δὲ πραγμάτων εὐάγγελον
ἥκοντα πρὸς χαίρουσαν εὐεστοῖ πόλιν—
πῶς κεδνὰ τοῖς κακοῖσι συμμίξω λέγων
χειμῶν', Ἀχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς;
ξυνώμοσαν γάρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρίν,
πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα, καὶ τὰ πίστ' ἐδειξάτην
φθείροντε τὸν δύστηνον Ἀργείων στρατόν,
ἐν νυκτί, δυσκύμαντα δ' ὠρώρει κακά.
ναῦς γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλησι Θρῄκιαι πνοαὶ
ἤρεικον· αἱ δὲ κεροτυπούμεναι βίᾳ

649. *σεσαγμένων.*

---

tinct from bad news'. Both functions are *τιμαὶ θεῶν*, but of different *θεοί* and not to be confounded.

645. **ἕλκος...πολλοὺς** accusatives in apposition to *πήματα*.—**πόλει...τὸ δήμιον**: the regular antithesis *ἰδίᾳ τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον* is replaced by an equivalent.—**ἕλκος... τυχεῖν** *a blow to be met* or *to sustain*.—**πολλοὺς...ἐξαγισθέντας** 'the taking of many a victim'; for the participial construction see *Theb.* 611 *γυμνωθὲν δόρυ* and note there.

647. **ἄνδρας** 'men' *i.e.* men singly as opposed to *πόλις*. Cf. the opposition of *ἄνδρες...ἀνήρ* in *Theb.* 584—599.

ib. **διπλῇ μάστιγι** 'two-pointed prong': see on *Theb.* 595 (and Dr Leaf on Hom. *Il.* 23. 387). The epithet *δίλογχος* shows that *μάστιξ* is not a whip. In *Theb. l.c.* it is a prong used for the killing of fish or game taken in a net. Here the expression *ἐξαγισθέντας* (*taken out as consecrated offerings*) suggests rather an instrument for taking from a victim or sacrifice the parts reserved for the gods or persons privileged, such as the *fleshhook of three teeth* mentioned in 1 Samuel ii. 13. The metaphor is the more likely, as Ares is a 'man-eating' god (*τούτῳ γὰρ Ἄρης βόσκεται, φόνῳ βροτῶν Theb.* 230, and see *inf. v.* 1511) and is said to have been worshipped with human sacrifice down to recorded times; Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* 22. 55 *ἐπεὶ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους φησὶν ὁ Ἀπολλόδωρος τῷ Ἄρει θύειν ἄνθρωπον* (reference supplied by Mr H. B. Smith).

649. **τοιῶνδε μέν τοι** *he indeed who* etc.; the sentence *ὅταν...φέρῃ* is resumed. In *μέν τοι* the particles have each their distinct forces: *μέν* answers to *δέ* in *v.* 651; *τοι of course*.—**πημάτων** constructed with *σεσαγμένον* as signifying 'fulness'.—**σεσαγμένον** Schütz. *σεσαγμένων* 'heaped' or 'packed upon him' is possible, but the other better.

650. **τόνδε**, either (1) 'such an ἀγγε-

the state wounded with one great national grief, and many a home robbed of its single victim by Ares' fork, his weapon beloved, two-headed, horrible, red in both prongs with blood; he that beareth such a pack of woe may well say a hymn to Those who punish. But when one cometh with tidings of deliverance to a folk rejoicing in happiness—how shall I mingle this good with that ill, with tale of the storm, at which our national gods must needs be displeased?

A conspiracy there was between two that had been utter foes, between fire and sea; and for pledge and proof of their league they destroyed the hapless men of Argos. In darkness it was done, which swelled the agony to its height; for the ships were dashed one against another by Thracian winds, till butting

---

λος' a resumptive pronoun: '*he*, the messenger of disaster, may naturally say a triumph-song *to the Erinyes*', the agents of punishment, but the messenger of good owes his duty elsewhere: or (2) with παιᾶνα, but as the statement is general, the pronoun, so construed, seems out of place.

653. He turns abruptly from the general case to himself as an instance of it.—*How can I mix good with bad, with a tale of the storm, which cannot but displease our nation's gods?*—**Ἀχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς**, literally 'a thing not unprovoking to the gods *of the Achaeans*': the emphasis on Ἀχαιῶν being given by position. **οὐκ ἀμήνιτον** (neuter) is an accusative in apposition to the verbal action (τὸ τὸν χειμῶνα λέγειν). **θεοῖς**: dative of the person whose judgment or view is in question.—The present hour of triumph is properly devoted to the *gods of Argos*: to narrate now a disaster inflicted by powers hostile to Argos and to them (*v.* 640) is as it were to interrupt their service (*vv.* 642—650) and risk their displeasure. Prof. Tucker (*Class. Rev.* VII. p. 341) defends the text nearly in the same way. Difficulty has arisen from taking ἀμήνιτον as masculine. The reading of Dobree Ἀχαιοῖς οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεῶν, commonly adopted, is not satisfactory: θεῶν can be explained as an extension of this primitive use with negative adjectives; see οὐκ ἄπαπτον πυρός (*v.* 323); but (1) the dative Ἀχαιοῖς, and (2) the stress on Ἀχαιοῖς are questionable.

655—657. See Appendix O.

655. Imitated by Milton *Par. Reg.* iv. 412 'Water with fire in ruin reconciled'. (Paley.)

658. *In darkness, which swelled the agony to its height*, literally 'in darkness, and terribly swollen was raised the distress'. Night aggravated the situation; the ships could not then be kept clear of each other and soon became unmanageable. This verse well illustrates the pregnant use of words in poetry. **δυσκύμαντα** is formed from the transitive κυμαίνω, meaning properly *make to swell*, from κῦμα, originally *that which is pregnant*, then *anything swollen*, then specially *a wave*. All the meanings here merge in a triple suggestion of *increase*, *labour*, and *tempest*.

659. **ἀλλήλῃσι**: irregular archaism for ἀλλήλαισι.

660. **κεροτυπούμεναι**: **ποιμένος**: the comparison is to a herd of cattle driven wild and scattered by a storm.

χειμῶνι τυφῶ σὺν ζάλῃ τ' ὀμβροκτύπῳ
ᾤχοντ' ἄφαντοι, ποιμένος κακοῦ στρόβῳ.
ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνῆλθε λαμπρὸν ἡλίου φάος,
ὁρῶμεν ἀνθοῦν πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον νεκροῖς
ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν ναυτικῶν τ' ἐρειπίων.
ἡμᾶς γε μὲν δὴ ναῦν τ' ἀκήρατον σκάφος
ἤτοι τις ἐξέκλεψεν ἢ 'ξῃτήσατο,
θεός τις, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, οἴακος θιγών.
τύχη δὲ σωτὴρ ναῦν θέλουσ' ἐφέζετο,
ὡς μήτ' ἐν ὁρμῷ κύματος ζάλην ἔχειν
μήτ' ἐξοκεῖλαι πρὸς κραταίλεων χθόνα.
ἔπειτα δ' Ἅιδην πόντιον πεφευγότες,
λευκὸν κατ' ἦμαρ, οὐ πεποιθότες τύχῃ,
ἐβουκολοῦμεν φροντίσιν νέον πάθος,
στρατοῦ καμόντος καὶ κακῶς σποδουμένου.
καὶ νῦν ἐκείνων εἴ τις ἔστιν ἐμπνέων,
λέγουσιν ἡμᾶς ὡς ὀλωλότας, τί μή;
ἡμεῖς τ' ἐκείνους ταὔτ' ἔχειν δοξάζομεν.
γένοιτο δ' ὡς ἄριστα· Μενέλεων γὰρ οὖν
πρῶτόν τε καὶ μάλιστα προσδόκα μολεῖν,

670. *ὅρμω.*

---

661. 'Under the storm of the hurricane and by the beating rain of the surge'. **σύν** instrumental. The line may be variously taken without difference, but this way (Sidgwick, Wecklein) is the simplest.—**ὄμβρος** *rain* belongs rather to the metaphor of the herd than to the ships.

662. **ποιμένος στρόβῳ** *lashed round by their cruel driver.* **στρόβῳ**: a unique word, literally, it would seem, meaning *spin*: *στροβέω* is *to spin.* **ποιμένος**: the storm itself in a new metaphorical aspect.

664—665. **ἀνθοῦν**: a last glimpse of the metaphor from the herd; the sea is the plain or field which in the morning is seen to have broken out in flowers after the rain. **νεκροῖς...ἐρειπίων**: 'with dead things, Achaean men and wreckage of ships'. The genitives define *νεκροῖς*. For the style of Aeschylus, it does not seem unnatural to suggest poetically that ships as well as men were 'dead'.—*ναυτικοῖς τ' ἐρειπίοις* Auratus, but the corruption is not easily explained.

666. **σκάφος**: the stripped vessel was *a hull entire* but no more.

667. "*Stole us away or begged us off* from destruction: a bold but quite characteristic phrase, requiring no emendation". Sidgwick.

669. *Fortune, to save us, was pleased to ride on board her.* **θέλουσα**: their miraculous escape must be put down to the caprice of fate.—The objection to this is,

violently beneath the storm of the hurricane and the beating rain of the surge they fled away and away, lashed round by their cruel driver. And when the bright dawn rose, we saw on the Ægean, thick as flowers, the wrecks of men and of ships. As for ourselves and our ship, yet whole in hull, we were stolen away or, may be, were begged off by some one more than human, who took her helm. Fortune, to save us, was pleased to ride aboard of her, and keep her alike from taking in the surging water between her planks and from running upon rocks. So having escaped a watery grave, there in the white day, scarce sure of our good fortune, we brooded melancholy upon our altered case, our host undone and utterly breaking to pieces. And at this moment if any of them is living and draws breath, they are doubtless speaking of us as lost, while we imagine the same case for them. But let us hope the best.

For Menelaus then, be it first supposed and soonest, that

---

that *ναῦν* should rather be supplied than expressed. — *ναυστολοῦσ'* (Casaubon) is good, but hazardous, and *θέλουσα* is in itself effective.

670. *So that she took not in the surging water between her planks.* **ἐν ἁρμῷ** (Wecklein) literally 'at a joining'. This brilliant suggestion may be accepted provisionally. It makes good sense, and without something of the kind *κύματος ζάλην ἔχειν* is incomplete. The rarity of *ἁρμός* and the familiarity of *ὅρμος* account for the error. —*ἐν ὅρμῳ*, *in the roads, at mooring*, seems unintelligible. Can it be conceived that in the circumstances described the vessel should be moored at all? The two obvious dangers were springing a leak and running upon island or rock.—**ἔχειν** *to take, get*: see on *v.* 724.—*ἐν ὁλκῷ κύματος* (G. F. Abbott, *Class. Rev.* XIII. 401, citing *οἴδματος ὁλκοί* Ap. Rhod. I. 1167). But is *ζάλην ἔχειν* by itself intelligible?

674. **ἐβουκολοῦμεν**: literally 'ruminated', *i.e. brooded on.*

675. **σποδουμένου**: a strong word from popular language. See on *Theb.* 794.

676. **εἴ τις ἔστιν ἐμπνέων** 'if any is in being and draws breath'.—For *ἔστι* cf. the phrases *οὐκέτ' ἔστι he is no more, he is dead*, *θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες* 'gods that live for ever' etc.—*ἐστὶν ἐμπνέων*, MS., *quasi* 'is breathing, is alive.' For other conjectures see Wecklein's Appendix.

679. **Μενέλεων γὰρ οὖν** *As for Menelaus then.* **γὰρ οὖν** marks that the narrative has now been brought to the point at which the question which drew it (*v.* 622) can be fully answered.

680. **πρῶτον...μολεῖν** *be it first and soonest supposed that he got home.* **προσδόκα**: *προσδοκᾶν* and *ἐλπίζειν*, like the English *expect*, are used in reference not only to the future, but also, with the sense *suppose*, to the present and past, and in that sense take the same tense in the sequent infinitive as other verbs of thinking. For examples see L. and Sc. *s. vv.*—**μολεῖν** *that he arrived, i.e.* that his ship, like that of Agamemnon, got home, that he reached the Peloponnese after the storm, only, being carried to a greater distance, at some other part of the coast. He would make for the nearest accessible point, not necessarily for Argos. It is natural that this not improbable and con-

εἰ δ' οὖν τις ἀκτὶς ἡλίου νιν ἱστορεῖ,
χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα, μηχαναῖς Διός
οὔπω θέλοντος ἐξαναλῶσαι γένος,
ἐλπίς τις αὐτὸν πρὸς δόμους ἥξειν πάλιν.
τοσαῦτ' ἀκούσας ἴσθι τἀληθῆ κλύων.

ΧΟ. τίς ποτ' ὠνόμαζεν ὧδ' — στρ. α'.
ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως
(μή τις ὅντιν' οὐχ ὁρῶμεν προνοί-
αισι τοῦ πεπρωμένου
γλῶσσαν ἐν τύχᾳ νέμων;)
τὰν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινει-
κῆ θ' Ἑλέναν; ἐπεὶ πρεπόντως
ἑλένας, ἕλανδρος, ἑλέπτολις,
ἐκ τῶν ἁβροτίμων
προκαλυμμάτων ἔπλευσεν
ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὔρᾳ,
πολύανδροί τε φεράσπιδες κυνα-
γοὶ κατ' ἴχνος πλατᾶν ἄφαντον

682. καὶ ζῶντα. 686. ὠνόμαξεν. 689. αις. 698. πλάταν.

---

soling supposition should be entertained, till it is disproved.—Not 'expect him to return' or 'that he will return'. This sense of the aorist, if it be possible in itself, is inadmissible here. The supposition put forward in *v.* 680 is manifestly something distinguished from ἐλπίς τις ἥξειν in *v.* 684.

681. **εἰ δ' οὖν** *and, supposing the contrary* (οὖν), *still if*, supposing, that is, he has not got in.—**τις...ἱστορεῖ** *any ray of the sun is discovering him.* Again here the language is coloured by a natural suggestion of the morning hour.

682. **χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα**: ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῶντα Hesychius; whence Toup restored it here. It is not certain that the gloss relates to this passage, but it is highly probable, and the improvement is great.—**μηχαναῖς Διός**: join with ἥξειν.

683. **γένος**: his offspring, the family of the Atridae, descended from him.—**οὔπω θέλοντος**: 'whose will it *never* is', *i.e.* 'who may be presumed not to will'.

684. **αὐτὸν** emphatic; 'for him, if for any, there is a hope'.

685. *This is all that I can tell you for fact*, literally '*so far* you may know that you have been told the facts'.—Exit the Herald. For the situation see the Introduction.

686. **ὠνόμαζεν** 'proposed to name', 'suggested the naming'.—The MS. has the aorist, in the Doric form **ὠνόμαξεν**. The tense is more suitable, but the forms in -ξω, -ξα are not commonly used in tragic chorus. We are perhaps not in a position to determine what subtleties of literary association might guide a poet in the use of such a composite and artificial

he got home. And at worst, if anywhere the sun's ray is discovering him, Zeus, we may hope, who cannot mean to destroy his offspring quite, will contrive to bring him alive and well to his home again. So much is all I can warrant you for fact. [*Exit.*

The Elders. Who can have given that name, so to the very letter true? Was it some unseen power, who by foreknowledge of fate guided his tongue aright, that named the woman wooed with battle and spear by the name of Helen? She proved her name indeed upon ships and men and peoples, when from the delicate veils of her costly bower she passed over sea, before the gale of the felon West, and after her a great hunt of shielded soldiers, following by the vanished track of the oar a quarry

---

language; see *v.* 1508. The Doric form would here prepare the way for *ἑλένας v.* 693, and the whole art of interpreting *ὀνόματα* seems to have been in its origin Sicilian; see *Journal of Philology* IX. p. 197. But it is likely that *ὠνόμαζεν* is an error; in *v.* 450 the reading of f is 'apparently *γεμίζων*', and see *v.* 776.

687. **ὧδ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως** 'with such entire and literal truth'. On *ἐτητύμως* and its etymological associations see the *Seven etc.*, Appendix II.—**ἐς τὸ πᾶν**, or **ἐς τοπὰν** *i.e.* 'with such literal truth in respect of his divination'? For the reasons in favour of *ἐς τοπὰν* see Appendix E and the *Journal of Philology* IX. pp. 128—141. The traditional reading is admissible.—Mr Sidgwick objects that the word *τοπά* *divination*, meaning not 'prophecy' but 'conjecture' as opposed to 'knowledge', is here unsuitable. But I submit that what was supposed to be 'divined' by the *μάντις* at the naming of a child was its yet undeveloped character (*φύσις*, see the article cited), and that this was 'divined' or 'conjectured'.

688. **μή**...; *Can it have been* etc.—**τις ὅντινα**, studiously vague, 'an unknown some one'.

690. **ἐν τύχᾳ** *aright*, 'so as to *hit* the mark', literally '*with* hit', or '*with* rightness', *ἐν* indicating circumstance. The phrase is very probably technical.

692. **Ἑλέναν** predicate with *ὠνόμαζεν*: *τὰν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινεικῆ τε* is substantival.

693. **ἑλένας** *destroyer* (see *ἑλεῖν*, *αἱρέω*) *of ships*, a Doric form from *ἑλέναϝς*, as *Μενέλας* from *Μενέλαϝς* *Menelaus* (retained by Salmasius, Enger and Sidgwick). Here the use of the exceptional form could hardly be avoided, if the point was to be made at all. With the Attic *ἑλέναυς* (Blomfield), which does not suggest the accusative *ἑλέναν*, the coincidence disappears.

694. **τῶν** *those*, as if they were famous, as in legend they probably were.—**ἁβροτίμων** *delicate-costly*, *ἁβρῶν καὶ τιμίων*.

695. **ἐκ προκαλυμμάτων......ἔπλευσεν** *she left her curtained bower to sail the sea*, imitated by Euripides, speaking of Medea flying with Jason (*Med.* 431), *ἐκ μὲν οἴκων ἔπλευσας* *thou didst quit for the sea thy father's house.*—For *πλεῦσαι* *to take to sea* cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1205 *πλεύσαντες αὖθις*.

696. **γίγαντος**: implying not merely strength, but fierce, uncontrolled strength, the *γίγαντες* being characteristically *rebels* against the divine law. In fact the wind itself typifies the wild and monstrous passion.

698. **πλατᾶν** Heath, the better accentuation; *in the oars' unseen track.*—Supply *ἔπλευσαν*.

κελσάντων Σιμόεντος
ἀκτὰς ἐπ' ἀξιφύλλους
δι' ἔριν αἱματόεσσαν.
Ἰλίῳ δὲ κῆδος ὀρ- ἀντ. α'.
θώνυμον τελεσσίφρων
μῆνις ἤλασε, τραπέζας ἀτί-
μωσιν ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ
καὶ ξυνεστίου Διὸς
πρασσομένα τὸ νυμφότι-
μον μέλος ἐκφάτως τίοντας,
ὑμέναιον, ὃς τότ' ἐπέρρεπεν
γαμβροῖσιν ἀείδειν.
μεταμανθάνουσα δ' ὕμνον
Πριάμου πόλις γεραιὰ
πολύθρηνον μέγα που στένει, κικλή-
σκουσα Πάριν τὸν αἰνόλεκτρον,
πάμπροσθ' ἢ πολύθρηνον
αἰῶν' ἀμφὶ πολιτᾶν
μέλεον αἷμ' ἀνατλᾶσα.

704. ἀτίμως ἵν'. 715. παμπρόσθη. 716. πολίταν.

---

699. **κελσάντων** *of them who had put in* or reached land, *i.e.* Paris and his company.—**Σιμόεντος ... αἱματόεσσαν** *to the banks of Simois, whose woods must be wasted by their bloody fray*, literally 'because of' it. **ἀξιφύλλους**: a 'proleptic' epithet describing the result of the hunt, means literally 'with leafage broken' and is formed from the stem of ἀγνύναι. For the sense of the verb see *Il.* 12. 146 ἀγροτέροισι σύεσσιν ἐοικότε, τώ τ' ἐν ὄρεσσιν | ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ κυνῶν δέχαται κολοσυρτὸν ἰόντα, | δοχμώ τ' ἀίσσοντε περὶ σφίσιν ἄγνυτον ὕλην, which passage or others like it Aeschylus probably had in his mind. In the metaphor Paris is the wild beast and Helen his spoil; the avenging Greeks are the huntsmen, who track their prey to the lair (Troy); the war is the fight which, as in Homer's picture, there ensues, and which devastates the surrounding wood or, without metaphor, causes the destruction and razing of Troy. —ἀεξιφύλλους (*leafy*) is the conjecture of Triclinius (*Cod. Farn.*). If this be adopted, it is better (since ἀεξιφύλλους δι' ἔριν αἱματόεσσαν 'whose forests will grow because of the bloody fray' is hardly sense) to join δι' ἔριν with the main verb; the pursuers come 'prompted by a bloody feud'. But there is no ground for change. —The antistrophe (*v.* 716) gives no evidence between ἀξιφύλλους and ἀεξιφύλλους, for it does not correspond exactly to either; and see further Appendix II.

702. **κῆδος ὀρθώνυμον**: a *marriage* or *bride* deserving the name in its other sense of *sorrow*. Cf. the play on κήδομαι—κηδεστής in *Theb.* 126.—**Ἰλίῳ** depends on κῆδος in the second sense.

landed on Simois' banks, whose woods must be wasted by their bloody fray.

A bride? A sorrowful bride she was to Ilium, pursued by sure-remembering wrath, destined one day to avenge the dishonour of the board, and of Zeus the sanctifier of the feast, upon those that gave expressive honour to that bridal music, the marriage-hymn of the groomsmen, their vantage of an hour. The aged city of Priam hath learnt an altered song, a burden surely of loud lamentation, and finds for the wedded Paris an evil name; for burdened with lamentation have been all her weary days till this for the miserable slaughter of her people.

---

704. **ἤλασε** *chased*, an echo of the metaphor of the hunt (?).—**ἤνυσεν** Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XIV, 116) with *ὀρθώνυμον*, *accomplished the meaning of the name* citing Soph. *Ant.* 1178 *τοὔπος ὡς ἄρ' ὀρθὸν ἤνυσας* etc.—**τραπέζας ἀτίμωσιν καὶ ξυν. Διός**: the offence of Paris against the laws of hospitality (*v.* 374). But by the reference to the 'table' and the description of Zeus as *ξυνέστιος* ('of the shared feast') for the more precise *ξένιος*, the speakers involuntarily touch another and ominous memory, the 'outraged table' of Atreus and his brother. See on *vv.* 136 foll., 1601.—**ἀτίμωσιν** Canter.

707. **πρασσομένα** *to avenge*, with accusatives of the offenders (*τοὺς*) *τίοντας* and the crime *ἀτίμωσιν*, literally 'exacting it of them'.—**τὸ** (*ἐκεῖνο*) *that*.

708. **ἐκφάτως**. *ἐκφάσθαι* means 'to speak out, articulate', Hom. *Od.* 10. 246 *οὐδέ τι ἐκφάσθαι δύνατο ἔπος ἱέμενός περ*, *ib.* 13. 308 *μηδέ τῳ ἐκφάσθαι...ἀλλὰ σιωπῇ πάσχειν ἄλγεα πολλά*. Accordingly *ἐκφάτως* should mean *expressively* (rather than *loudly*, Paley). According to legend, the alternative name of Paris, *'Αλέξανδρος* (*repelling the husband*), was bestowed upon him for the rape (see Eur. *fr.* 65 Dindorf). From what follows (*v.* 713) it is likely that *ἐκφάτως* refers to this; the Trojans found a significant expression for their admiration of the robber's feat.—**τίοντας** (impf. tense) *did honour to it*, *i.e.* celebrated it with zeal (cf. *παιᾶνα ἐτίμα v.* 258, Wecklein).

709. **ἐπέρρεπεν** *fell to them*, inclined to them as a scale, which now is turned the other way.—**γαμβροῖσιν ἀείδειν** 'to sing as kinsmen of the groom'.

713. **πολύθρηνον** predicate with *στένει*. Supply *αὐτόν*, *i.e. τὸν ὕμνον*.—**μέγα**, or **μετά** (Schneidewin), *i.e. μεταστένει*, 'chants with repentant change'?—**κικλήσκουσα...αἰνόλεκτρον**: finding for Paris names very different from the triumphant *'Αλέξανδρος* (see on *v.* 708). In choosing the contrasted name *αἰνόλεκτρος* Aeschylus is guided perhaps by a certain similarity, with transposition of sounds, to *'Αλέξανδρος*.

715—717. *For full of lamentation have been all her weary days till now for the miserable slaughter of her people*, literally 'she who sustained all-before a life full of lamentation for' etc.—**πάμπροσθ' ἤ** Blomfield: **πολιτᾶν** Auratus. This sentence takes up the word *πολύθρηνον* from *v.* 713, echoing and explaining it after Aeschylus' manner.—**πάμπροσθε... αἰῶνα...ἀνατλᾶσα**. The adverb, though joined in construction with the verb *ἀνατλᾶσα*, qualifies in effect the substantive *αἰῶνα*. For the 'Ionic' *η* see *vv.* 428, 1104 etc.—**αἷμα**: so *αὐτάδελφον αἷμα the slaying of a brother*, *Theb.* 705, and see L. and Sc. *s. v. αἷμα*.—The difficulties found in this passage arise from the hypo-

ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντος στρ. β'.
ἶνιν δόμοις ἀγάλακτον
οἴτας ἀνὴρ φιλόμαστον,
ἐν βιότου προτελείοις
ἅμερον, εὐφιλόπαιδα,
καὶ γεραροῖς ἐπίχαρτον.
πολέα δ' ἔσχ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις
νεοτρόφου τέκνου δίκαν
φαιδρωπὸς ποτὶ χεῖρα σαί-
νων τε γαστρὸς ἀνάγκαις.
χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἀντ. β'.
ἦθος το πρὸς τοκέων· χά-
ριν γὰρ τροφᾶς ἀμείβων
μηλοφόνοισιν ἄταις
δαῖτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν,
αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη,
ἄμαχον ἄλγος οἰκέταις,
μέγα σίνος πολυκτόνον·
ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἱερεύς τις ἄ-
τας δόμοις προσεθρέφθη.
πάραυτα δ' ἐλθεῖν ἐς Ἰλίου πόλιν στρ. γ'.
λέγοιμ' ἂν φρόνημα μὲν νηνέμου γαλάνας,

718—19. λέοντα σίνιν. 720. οὖτος (ως). 729. ἔθος. τοκήων. 734. ἄμαχον δ'. 737. προσετράφη.

---

thesis of *syllabic* correspondence between strophe and antistrophe. Apart from metre the readings (not changes) of Blomfield and Auratus are satisfactory. As to the metre see Appendix II.

718. **λέοντος ἶνιν** Conington.

719. **ἀγάλακτον** (ὄντα), the dam being killed by the huntsmen who took the whelp.—Dr Wecklein reads ἀγάλακτα βούτας (see below)· ἀνὴρ φιλομάστων, translating ἀγάλακτα φιλομάστων by "*as foster-brother of the sucklings* in his herd. Cf. Hesych. ἀγάλαξ· ὁμότιτθος, *Etym. M.* III. 42 ἀγάλακτες οἱ ἀδελφοί, παρὰ τὸ α σημαῖνον τὸ ὁμοῦ, ὁμογάλακτές τινες ὄντες, Suid. ἀγάλακτες· ὅμαιμοι, ἀδελφοί".

720. **οἴτας ἀνὴρ** *a shepherd*: οἴτης from ὄις, as βούτης from βοῦς. **βότας** Heusde, **βούτας** Wecklein. Something like this, some description attached to ἀνήρ, is to be sought in οὗτος. But οἴτας is closer, and permits the retention of ἀγάλακτον.—ὄϝτας would be closer still, but seems not to be a possible formation from ὀϝι-τας.

723. *Making dignity itself to smile.* **ἐπίχαρτον.** For χαρά and the cognate words see on *Theb.* 429.—**καὶ** *even*, not

A shepherd man in his house brought up a lion's whelp, weaned from the teat, a hungry suckling. Gentle it was in its infant days of love, made friends with youth, drew smiles from gravity's self. And many a thing it got when, like a nursing-child embraced, it fixed a bright eye on the hand and fawned for its belly's need. But after a time it showed the way that was born in it; for it paid thanks for its rearing by bloody ravage of the flock, making a feast unbidden; and the house was dabbled with gore, and the house-folk helpless in agony, and wide was the murderous waste. By God's will it was taken into that dwelling, to do rites of ravage therein.

At first, would I say, to Ilium came what seemed to fancy a windless calm, a darling of rich indolence, whose gentle eye

---

'and'.—**γεραροῖς**: not 'seniors' (*γεραιοῖς*).—**εὐφιλόπαιδα**, 'easily making friends with the *παῖδες*', including the *servants* as well as the *children*. The *γεραροί* are Homer's *αἰδοῖοι*, the masters and graver persons in the house generally.

724. **πολέα δ' ἔσχε** *and many a thing it got*: the pretty tricks of the beast made every one pet it and feed it.—For *σχεῖν* *to get* see Pindar *Ol.* 2. 10 *ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα* *they got a sacred habitation*, *Pyth.* 1. 65 *ἔσχον δ' Ἀμύκλας*, *Pyth.* 3. 24 *ἔσχε τοιαύταν ἀϝάταν* *she conceived such a delusion*, etc., with Gildersleeve's notes.—**ἐν ἀγκάλαις** goes with the words which follow and specially with *νεοτρόφου*.

726. **φαιδρωπὸς......σαίνων τε.** *φαιδρωπὸς* is treated as a participle, *quasi φαιδρῶς προσορῶν τὴν χεῖρα*: cf. *vv.* 349, 547, 1075 etc.—*φαιδρωπῶς* (Weil), *σαίνοντα* (Auratus), translated 'and often he held it in his arms' etc. So Wecklein. The translation of *ἔσχε* by 'it lay' is incorrect, and *ἔσκε* (*it was*, Casaubon) an inappropriate word.

729. **ἦθος** Conington.—**τὸ πρὸς τοκέων** 'which it had from its parents'.

731. **ἄταις** *ruin*, *ravage*, as in Soph. *Ai.* 308 (Ajax coming to his senses sees the animals he has killed) *καὶ πλῆρες ἄτης ὡς διοπτεύει στέγος.*—*ἄταισιν* (*i.e.* *ἄταισιν*?) h, *ἄσαισιν* *surfeit* Conington, *ἀυταῖς* *shrieks* Ahrens, *ἀγαῖσιν* *wreckage* Klausen, etc., for metre; but see Appendix II.

734. **ἄμαχον ἄλγος**: accusative in apposition to the conception *αἵματι... ἐφύρθη*. The conjunction *δέ* in f is due to mistake of the construction.

736—737. **ἐκ θεοῦ**: 'providentially, by divine suggestion', the divine power avenging the lions, as the eagles in *v.* 57.—**δόμοις προσεθρέφθη** 'was reared as an *additional* inmate of the house', was added to the household (Dr Headlam, *On editing Aeschylus* p. 108); not 'was reared in the house'.—**προσεθρέφθη** Heath.—*προσετράφθη* (Ionic aor. of *προστρέπω*) 'was *directed to* the house', ed. 1.; but I would withdraw this, being satisfied that my objections to *προσεθρέφθη* were mistaken.—**ἱερεύς τις ἄτας**: '*as* a minister of ruin', *i.e.* to be such. *ἱερεύς*, properly '*sacrificer to* ruin'.—*προσετρίφθη*, 'was inflicted upon', Prof. Bury (*Class. Rev.* XI. 448), using against *προσεθρέφθη* my own argument, that metre would have protected it; but see Headlam *l.c.*

738. **πάραυτα** *at first*, *παραχρῆμα* (Hesychius), derived from *παρ' αὐτά* 'just upon the event'. So in Eur. *fr.* 1064 *πάραυτα δ' ἡσθεὶς ὕστερον στένει μέγα* (Wecklein).—**ἐλθεῖν**: the real subject is *Helen*, the aspects or effects of whose presence are personified.

739. **φρόνημα μὲν νηνέμου γαλάνας** *the imagination* or *presumption of a wind-*

ἀκασκαῖον †ἄγαλμα πλούτου,
μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος,
δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος,
παρακλίνασ᾽ ἐπέκρανεν
δὲ γάμου πικροῦ τελευτάς,
δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος
συμένα Πριαμίδαισιν
πομπᾷ Διὸς ξενίου,
νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς.
παλαίφατος δ᾽ ἐν βροτοῖς γέρων λόγος ἀντ. γ΄.
τέτυκται, μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὄλβον
τεκνοῦσθαι μηδ᾽ ἄπαιδα θνῄσκειν,
ἐκ δ᾽ ἀγαθᾶς τύχας γένει
βλαστάνειν ἀκόρεστον οἰζύν.
δίχα δ᾽ ἄλλων μονόφρων εἰ-
μί· τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον
μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει,
σφετέρᾳ δ᾽ εἰκότα γέννᾳ.
οἴκων γὰρ εὐθυδίκων
καλλίπαις πότμος αἰεί.
φιλεῖ δὲ τίκτειν ὕβρις μὲν παλαιὰ νεά- στρ. δ΄.
ζουσαν ἐν κακοῖς βροτῶν
ὕβριν τότ᾽ ἢ τόθ᾽, ὅτε τὸ κύριον μόλῃ

755. γὰρ δυσσεβές. 762. ὅταν.

---

less calm, *i.e.* 'what was presumed a secure enjoyment'. This seems to be the meaning (rather than that the spirit (?) of Helen was like a windless calm). *φρόνημα* is to be understood as qualifying the whole description in *vv.* 739—742; hence the position of *μέν*. For the sense of *φρόνημα*, '*proud* thought', '*presumptuous* imagination', see L. and Sc. *s. v.*

740. **ἀκασκαῖόν τ᾽** Hermann (see *v.* 751) may be right, though the conjunction is not desirable. Nothing can be determined without more certainty as to the meaning and use of *ἀκασκαῖος*. The MS. points rather to *ἀκασκαίων*.—*ἀκασκα· ἡσύχως, μαλακῶς, βραδέως* Hesychius.—The accumulation here of terms in apposition admits in English only a paraphrase.

743. **ἐπέκρανεν**, 'accomplished', marks what happened *in the result*.—*She made such end to the marriage that it cost them dear.* *πικρὰς* is suggested by f as a correction, but **πικροῦ** as a proleptic epithet expresses the same thing. For the use

shot that soft bolt, which pricks from the heart the flower of love. But swerving from that, she made them repent in the end that she was won, blasting with her companionship the ruined house of Priam's sons, whither the god of guest-plight sped and conducted her, a fiend to wed and to rue.

It is an ancient maxim, made long ago among men, that wealth of man, grown big, gets offspring of its body before it die, and that of good fortune the natural scion is unappeasable woe. But I think not with the generality. It is in truth the impious deed, which after begetteth more, and like to its own kind. The house that keepeth righteousness, fair is the generation thereof for ever. But it is the way of old pride to beget in the wicked, soon or late, when the destined hour arrives for the youthful birth, a young pride, and the kindred spirit (?) of inso-

---

of πικρός see Eur. *Med.* 398 πικροὺς δ' ἐγώ σφιν καὶ λυγροὺς θήσω γάμους, *Bacch.* 357, *Supp.* 832 etc.

745. **δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος** *an ill companion in the ruined home*, a poetic exaggeration of language such as might apply to an ill-assorted union; the conception of Helen as a bride wedded to Troy is pursued throughout.

747. **πομπᾷ**, still a bridal term, the *pompa* or religious procession which brought the wife to her new home.

748. **νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς** *a fiend to wed and to rue.* **νυμφόκλαυτος**: literally 'bewept as a wife', *i.e.* one whose wedding costs tears of repentance. Some render νυμφόκλαυτος 'bewailed by brides', *i.e.* causing the Trojan women to weep. But see the preceding context.—'Eine Thränenbraut' Wecklein, rightly.

749. "Aeschylus is rejecting the old Greek superstition that Prosperity or Wealth brings woe; it is not wealth, he says, but always Sin" (Sidgwick). This later doctrine had also been embodied in a proverb older than Aeschylus. See on *v.* 760.

750. **μέγαν τελεσθέντα** *when it comes to its full growth*, adultum. See *v.* 370.

751. **τεκνοῦσθαι** metaphorically; the 'child' is calamity; see next verses.

752. **γένει** *by kind*, according to nature.

754. **μονόφρων** *alone in my way of thinking.*

755. **τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ** Pauw, on metrical grounds; see *v.* 744.

756. **μετὰ** *afterwards.*

759. **καλλίπαις πότμος** combines in one phrase the ideas that the prosperity of the house is reproduced in successive generations, and that this prosperity is itself the child of righteousness, as misery is of sin.

760. **φιλεῖ δὲ τίκτειν ὕβρις...ὕβριν.** Similar language with slight variations occurs in an ancient oracle cited by Herodotus (8. 77), in Pindar (*Ol.* 13. 9), and elsewhere in Aeschylus (*Eum.* 536); it was evidently consecrated by religious tradition. For some remarks upon the origin of it see *Seven against Thebes*, Appendix II. p. 142.

762. **τότ' ἢ τότε** *at this time or that*, *i.e.* sooner or later.—**ὅτε...μόλῃ**: archaic and poetical construction, for which the MS. has substituted the regular ὅταν, added originally as an explanatory note (Klausen).

†νεαρὰ φάους κότον, δαίμονά τε τὸν ἄμαχον, ἀπό-
λεμον,
ἀνίερον θράσος, μελαί-
νας μελάθροισιν ἄτας,
εἰδομέναν τοκεῦσιν.†
δίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν δυσκάπνοις δώμασιν, ἀντ. δʹ.
τὸν δ' ἐναίσιμον τίει.
τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἔδεθλα σὺν πίνῳ χερῶν
παλιντρόποις ὄμμασι λιποῦσ' ὅσια προσέβατο,
δύναμιν οὐ σέβουσα πλού-
του παράσημον αἴνῳ·
πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ.

ἄγε δή, βασιλεῦ, Τροίας πολίπορθ',
'Ατρέως γένεθλον,
πῶς σε προσείπω; πῶς σε σεβίζω
μήθ' ὑπεράρας μήθ' ὑποκάμψας
καιρὸν χάριτος;
πολλοὶ δὲ βροτῶν τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι
προτίουσι δίκην παραβάντες.
τῷ δυσπραγοῦντι δ' ἐπιστενάχειν
πᾶς τις ἕτοιμος· δεῖγμα δὲ λύπης

768. τίει βίον. 769. ἐσθλά. 770. προσέβα τοῦ.
776. σεβίξω.

763—766. Injured, and not to be restored with any certainty. The general sense is that ὕβρις (the parent) gives birth to ὕβρις (the child) and also to θράσος, an offspring like the progenitors.—In *v.* 763 something extraneous has been incorporated with the text: I translate the readings (1) ὅτε τὸ κύριον μόλῃ νεαρὰ φάους, *when the young one* (the young ὕβρις) *comes to the appointed hour of light* (τὸ κύριον φάους), *i.e.* of birth, and (2) δαίμονα τ' ἔταν (ἐτᾶν Wecklein) *and a kindred spirit.* In *vv.* 764—766 either the plural εἰδομένας, or else the dual throughout μελαίνα...ἄτα...εἰδομένα, seems correct, the second better (Donaldson). For a great number of suggestions see Wecklein's Appendix.

768. **τὸν ἐναίσιμον** *the virtuous man.*—βίον (omitted by Ahrens) is a mistaken completion.

769. **ἔδεθλα** *abodes*, Auratus. The MS. error is due to the omission of repeated letters in δεδεθλα; hence εθλα, corrected to ἐσθλά.

770. **ὅσια προσέβατο**, supply ἔδεθλα: *she goes to the holy* (gnomic aorist).—I see no reason to doubt that it is this aorist προσέβατο which appears, slightly concealed, in the MS., part being read

lence, godless, resistless, masterless, black curses both to the mansion and like their parents both.

But righteousness shineth in sooty dwellings, and prizeth the modest man. If the palace is gilt but foul the hands, with eyes averted she goes thence to the pure home, disdaining the might of wealth mis-stamped with praise. And she guideth all to the goal.

[*Enter* AGAMEMNON *and* CASSANDRA, *a multitude following.*]

See now, O sovereign, Troy's conqueror, Atreus' son, how shall I address thee? How pay thee homage neither above nor short of due complaisance?

Many rate semblance above reality, and do injustice so. Sighs for the suffering all have ready, although of the outward

---

as the usual form προσέβα, and the termination corrected into the appearance of a possessive genitive. For analogous forms compare ἔφην—ἐφάμην, ἔφθην—φθάμενος, ἔπτην—ἐπτάμην, ἔκταν—ἔκτατο, etc. Some of these aorists actually extant are extremely rare (φθάμενος for instance); so are other analogous forms from the stem βα- itself (*e.g.* ὑπέρβασαν for ὑπερέβησαν *Il.* 12. 469); and it is probably the merest accident that the small fraction of archaic Greek literature now remaining does not, if it does not, exhibit any example but this of the middle form ἐβάμην, which must, it would seem, have been at the command of any archaistic writer who chose to employ it. The corrections proposed here, προσέμολε Hermann, προσέσυτο Ahrens, etc., do not account for the MS. reading. If we suppose an explanatory gloss, the author of a gloss would naturally have used the common vocabulary (*e.g.* προσῆλθε) not a poetic word like προσέβα. The presumption in favour of the existence of the 'middle' aorist may be measured by considering how very few would venture to say, without consulting books, whether it is extant or not.

772. **παράσημον αἴνῳ** *mis-stamped with praise*, like a forged coin bearing an untrue mark of value.

774—800. Agamemnon enters in a chariot, followed by Cassandra, also in a chariot, attended by his soldiers, and surrounded by an applauding crowd. The elders are only too well aware that this apparently unanimous enthusiasm is by many pretended, and their first thought is to suggest suspicion and apprise the king that he is being deceived. See the Introduction.

776. **σεβίζω**: σεβίξω f, Doric aorist subj., here impossible. But the fact that such an unfamiliar form was regarded as possible and not at once corrected is perhaps some evidence that Aeschylus did occasionally employ it. See on *v.* 686.

777. **ὑπεράρας** 'over-aiming', a metaphor from the *raised* bow, **ὑποκάμψας** 'turning short of', from the chariot race.

780. **προτίουσι** τοῦ εἶναι, 'value above (reality)', supplied from **τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι** *the appearance of reality*. The πολλοί who like to be deceived are contrasted with the ἀγαθὸς προβατογνώμων. Not 'many prefer *to deceive*'. The elders, who are expecting recognition as the 'faithful found', are vexed by the flattering demonstration going on around them; but they rely, they say, on the fairness (δίκη) and judgment of the king to acknowledge his true friends and detect imposture. See on *v.* 785.

782. **δεῖγμα δὲ κτλ.** *when the display*

οὐδὲν ἐφ' ἧπαρ προσικνεῖται·
καὶ ξυγχαίρουσιν ὁμοιοπρεπεῖς
ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα βιαζόμενοι.
ὅστις δ' ἀγαθὸς προβατογνώμων,
οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν ὄμματα φωτός,
τὰ δοκοῦντ' εὔφρονος ἐκ διανοίας,
ὑδαρεῖ σαίνειν φιλότητι.
σὺ δέ μοι τότε μὲν στέλλων στρατιὰν
Ἑλένης ἕνεκ' (οὐ γὰρ ἐπικεύσω†)
κάρτ' ἀπομούσως ἦσθα γεγραμμένος
οὐδ' εὖ πραπίδων οἴακα νέμων,
θάρσος ἑκούσιον
ἀνδράσι θνῄσκουσι κομίζων·

794. *θράσος.*

---

of grief reaches not at all to the heart. **δεῖγμα λύπης**, *i.e.* 'the grief displayed', the Greek and English idioms coinciding. For *δείκνυμι* in the sense of *ostentation* see L. and Sc. *s.v.*, and for *οὐδέν* as an emphatic negative, *ib. s.v. οὐδείς.*—**δῆγμα** Stobaeus and (presumably by conjecture) *Cod. Farn.* The motive of the change may have been to give *οὐδέν* its common adjectival sense, 'no sting of grief'. But *δῆγμα* spoils the sense. The point is not that the grief does not *wound*, but that there is no grief at all.—For a defence of *δῆγμα λύπης* as a 'periphrasis for *λύπη*' see Dr Headlam, *On editing Aeschylus* p. 102.

784. **καὶ ξυγχαίρουσιν** (*τῷ χαίροντι*) **ὁμοιοπρεπεῖς** *and they copy the looks of him that is glad.* *χαίρειν* (see on *v.* 723) refers originally to the look, not to the feeling, of happiness.—It is debated whether *ξυγχαίρουσιν* is finite verb or dative participle depending on *ὁμοιοπρεπεῖς* 'seeming like sympathizers'. If it is the participle, the verb must have been contained in the line which may be lost after *v.* 785. The objection to this is that *τῷ δυσπραγοῦντι κτλ.* raises expectation of an antithetic *καὶ τῷ χαίροντι ξυγχαίρουσιν*, so that *ξυγχαίρουσιν*, when heard, would naturally be understood as a verb.—See however Dr Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XIV. 116 and XVII. 244.

785. **βιαζόμενοι.** | **ὅστις.** The break is contrary to the rule of this metre. If it is not an oversight, we may suppose either (with Hermann) that something is lost, or that some interval (perhaps a change of voices) protected the hiatus. There is at any rate a strong break in the sense; *ὅστις δὲ κτλ.* is antithetic not to what immediately precedes, but to *vv.* 779—780; see note there. It is possible that the hiatus was made deliberately in order to mark this.

786. **προβατογνώμων**: one who, like a good herdsman, 'knows the points', as it were, of men. Probably some particular deceptive symptom in the animal suggests the *ὑδαρὴς φιλότης*.

787. **οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν** *it cannot escape* (*him*). The object of **λαθεῖν** is *τοῦτον*, supplied from the relative clause.—**ὄμματα φωτός**: the *human eyes* (*φωτὸς* antithetic to *προβατο-*) of hypocrites who pretend to weep tears of sympathetic joy

grief none touches the heart; and they copy the looks of him that laughs, putting force upon faces where no smile is. But he that knoweth the points of a man is sure to detect, when the human eyes, which pretend to glisten with kindness, are flattering him with a love that is but water.

Thou in past time, while warring still for Helen's sake, (frankly be it said) didst make an ungracious figure in mine eyes, didst seem an undexterous steersman to thy wits, that thou for a willing wanton wouldst spend the lives of men. But

---

or sorrow.—**ὄμματα...φιλότητι.** This whole substantival clause is the subject of *λαθεῖν*; 'the man of judgment will detect that those eyes, which pretend (to glisten) with kind feeling, are flattering him with a love that is but water', when such is really the case. The word *σαίνειν*, in relation to the expression of the eye, signifies merely the look of kindness (Soph. *O. C.* 319), though it easily takes the sense of flattery. Here it is to be supplied with *τὰ δοκοῦντα* from the main verb of the sentence.—If **σαίνει** (Casaubon) be read, *τὰ* becomes relative and nominative, the subject of *σαίνει*, the infinitive being supplied with *δοκοῦντα* as before.

790. **τότε** *before, i.e.* during the continuance of the war, *στέλλων στρατιάν*.

791. Perhaps **οὐ γὰρ ἔπη κεύσω** *for I will speak out* (*what I am thinking*), literally 'will not suppress speech'. The singular (*κεύθειν ἔπος*) is common in Homer, see L. and Sc. *s. vv. κεύθω, ἐπικεύθω*.—Or **οὐκ ἐπικεύσω** (Hermann) absolutely, *I will make no concealment*, also Homeric.

792. *Thou hadst no pleasing figure to my eyes*, 'wast in my view pictured unpleasingly'.

793. *I.e.* as not showing a full command of your judgment.

794—95. **ἀνδράσι θνήσκουσι κομίζων** 'in spending the lives of men to recover (Helen)'. For *κομίζειν* in this connexion see Eur. *Iph. A.* 770 χάλκασπις Ἄρης Ἑλέναν ἐκ Πριάμου κομίσαι θέλων ἐς γᾶν Ἑλλάδα, id. *Or.* 1614 (Menelaus speaks) ὦ τλῆμον Ἑλένη...σὲ σφάγιον ἐκόμισ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν, and for numerous examples L. and Sc. *s. v.*—**ἀνδράσι θνήσκουσι**: instrumental dative, as with words signifying purchase, literally 'with dying men'. The complaint here is the same as in *v.* 455 foll.—**θάρσος ἑκούσιον** (*θάρσος Cod. Farn.*) should not be hastily condemned. What the context requires is some description of Helen such as to mark the folly of spending lives to win her back (Weil, cf. *v.* 62). Now **ἑκούσιον** *consenting* is to the point and may be illustrated by Eur. *El.* 1065 ἡ μὲν γὰρ (Helen) ἁρπασθεῖσ' ἑκοῦσ' ἀπῴχετο, and id. *Tro.* 370, which paraphrases and expands *ἑκούσιον* here, ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς (Agamemnon) ὁ σοφὸς ἐχθίστων ὕπερ | τὰ φίλτατ' ὤλεσ', ἡδονὰς τὰς οἴκοθεν | τέκνων ἀδελφῷ δοὺς γυναικὸς οὕνεκα, | καὶ ταῦθ' ἑκούσης κοὐ βίᾳ λελησμένης: a woman who surrendered herself to the seducer was not worth recovery at all, much less at such a cost. Nor is **θάρσος** difficult in itself. Like *μῖσος* and *στύγος*, so *θάρσος* or *θράσος* is used in a personal sense (*e.g.* Eur. *Andr.* 261 ὦ βάρβαρον σὺ θρέμμα καὶ σκληρὸν θράσος), and it is common as a synonym of **ἀναίδεια**. The form *θράσος* is more frequent in this sense (in fact seldom has any other, which accounts for the reading of f here), but *θάρσος* is used so also. There is no reason therefore why *θάρσος* here should not mean *a wanton*, that is Helen herself. The question then is whether *θάρσος* in this particular sense was sufficiently established in popular

νῦν δ' οὐκ ἀπ' ἄκρας φρενὸς οὐδ' ἀφίλως.
εὔφρων πόνος εὖ τελέσασιν.
γνώσει δὲ χρόνῳ διαπευθόμενος
τόν τε δικαίως καὶ τὸν ἀκαίρως
πόλιν οἰκουροῦντα πολιτῶν.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

πρῶτον μὲν Ἄργος καὶ θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους
δίκῃ προσειπεῖν, τοὺς ἐμοὶ μεταιτίους
νόστου δικαίων θ' ὧν ἐπραξάμην πόλιν
Πριάμου· δίκας γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώσσης θεοὶ
κλύοντες ἀνδροθνῆτας, Ἰλίου φθοράς,
ἐς αἱματηρὸν τεῦχος οὐ διχορρόπως
ψήφους ἔθεντο· τῷ δ' ἐναντίῳ κύτει
ἐλπὶς προσῄει χειρὸς οὐ πληρουμένῳ.
καπνῷ δ' ἁλοῦσα νῦν ἔτ' εὔσημος πόλις.
ἄτης θύελλαι ζῶσι· συνθνῄσκουσα δὲ

---

use to make *θάρσος ἑκούσιον* intelligible, with this context, in the sense *a consenting wanton.* The text is some evidence for the affirmative, and the parallel passages from Euripides above cited suggest that such language, applied to the case of Helen, was a traditional commonplace. See further, in support of this view, Dr Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XIV. 116.—What the elders have in their minds is the recent (and in truth unappeased) indignation of the people for the loss of life in the war.

796. **νῦν δ'...ἀφίλως.** *But now our picturing of thee is not* (*thus*) *superficial and unkind.* The verb is *γεγραμμένος εἶ* 'thou art represented', or something to the same effect, supplied from the antithetic clause *τότε...ἦσθα γεγραμμένος.* 'Now that the suffering is over and the end won, we can revise our hasty judgment and make fair allowance'.—**ἀπ' ἄκρας φρενὸς** literally 'with the surface (only) of the mind'. Cf. Eur. *Hec.* 242 *οὐ γὰρ ἄκρας καρδίας ἔψαυσέ μου* 'it made a more than superficial (deep) impression on me'. The term *ἀπ' ἄκρας φρενός* is taken or imitated, like *ἀπομούσως*, from the vocabulary of criticism.

797. **εὔφρων...τελέσασιν** *men think happily of their sufferings, when they have won success,* literally 'a toil is happy in the view of those who have well accomplished it'. Probably a proverb: for the favourite play on *εὖ* see on *v.* 557.—This is commonly joined as one sentence to *v.* 796, but it is almost universally admitted (see conjectures in Wecklein's Appendix) that so taken it gives no satisfactory sense.

801—845. Agamemnon's speech has two divisions: (1) 801—820 Salutation to the gods and thanks (not very becomingly expressed) for his victory, (2) his answer to the hints of the elders; he is on his guard and intends to treat all according to their deserts. In the first part, notwithstanding the proud tone, there is a hint of exculpation in reference to the destruction of Troy; he insists upon the share of *the gods* in the work and the

now we figure thee with deeper judgment and less unkind. Happy the labour that is happily done. Thou wilt learn by inquisition hereafter, who here at home hath done his duty, and who hath mis-spent the time.

Agamemnon. To Argos first my salutation is due, and to the gods that inhabit here, who have aided me to my home-coming and the justice which I have taken of Priam's town. For they, having heard the mortal argument which with main force we pleaded for Troy's destroying, put their votes undivided into the vase for blood, while to the opposite urn hope of the hand came nigh, yet it was not filled. By her smoke the conquered city is conspicuous even yet. Life in the ruin pants,

---

profits of vengeance. In the second part his selfish and imperious nature is fatally exhibited, when, with every motive to be complaisant, he takes occasion to make a bitter attack upon those to whom he owes his triumph. The whole harangue is haughty and repulsive.

802. **δίκη**: both *custom* and *justice.*—**τοὺς ἐμοὶ μεταιτίους** *who with me have contributed to* etc., a strange form for the expression of religious gratitude.

803. **πόλιν**: the gods approved the destruction of *the city*. See *v.* 815.

804. **δίκας οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώσσης** *our cause argued not with the tongue*, but with the sword. Cf. *δίκην εἰπεῖν to plead a cause.*

805. **ἀνδροθνῆτας** (*δίκας*) *a mortal argument*, *i.e.* one in which was demanded the penalty of death.—**Ἰλίου φθορὰς** *importing the destruction of Troy*, literally 'a destruction to Troy', in apposition to *δίκας*, as *ἰσχύς* to *τεύκη* in *v.* 299, and with the same adjectival force. The phrase translates the metaphor of *ἀνδροθνῆτας* into the literal fact.—*φθορᾶς* (Dobree) gives the same sense, *a suit of* (*i.e. for*) *destruction.*—The construction *φθορὰς ψήφους-ἔθεντο* (*ἐψηφίσαντο*), 'they voted the destruction' (Paley), is embarrassed by the words *ἐς αἱματηρὸν τεῦχος*.

806. **αἱματηρὸν τεῦχος** *the bloody vessel*, that which was to receive votes for the penalty of death.

807. "*But to the opposite urn hope of the hand came nigh, yet it was not filled*, a quaint and fanciful but quite characteristic way of saying that the other urn expected votes but did not get them" (Sidgwick). **ἐλπὶς** with emphasis, hope *only*, and no actual hand with a vote.—**Ἐλπὶς προσείει χεῖρας**, 'Hope waved her hand before it' as if to put votes there (Margoliouth), is so close to the MS. that it must almost be called an alternative reading of it. But the associations of *σείειν*, *προσείειν* do not seem pertinent, and the common text is satisfactory.—The 'hope' refers to the long postponement of the capture by the dissensions of Olympus.

809. A bitter jest; the city may boast itself 'conspicuous' still. **καπνῷ** with *εὔσημος*.

810 *Life in the ruin pants, while from the expiring ash is breathed a reek of richness.* **ἄτης θύελλαι ζῶσι**, literally 'in the ruin are living blasts': for *ἄτης* see *v.* 731. *θύελλα*, usually 'blast' of a storm, is used here as a sort of gigantic term for a 'gasp', the glowing heap being compared to a dying animal.—**συνθνήσκουσα σποδὸς**. When the ash is cold, the gasps of life will cease; with them therefore the ash is dying.—**πίονας πλούτου πνοάς**. The chief symbol of Eastern wealth to a Greek mind was the costly perfume imported from Asia for

σποδὸς προπέμπει πίονας πλούτου πνοάς.
τούτων θεοῖσι χρὴ πολύμνηστον χάριν
τίνειν, ἐπείπερ καὶ ταγὰς ὑπερκότους
ἐπραξάμεσθα, καὶ γυναικὸς οὕνεκα
πόλιν διημάθυνεν Ἀργεῖον δάκος,
ἵππου νεοσσός, ἀσπιδηστρόφος λεώς,
πήδημ' ὀρούσας ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν·
ὑπερθορὼν δὲ πύργον ὠμηστὴς λέων
ἄδην ἔλειξεν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ.
θεοῖς μὲν ἐξέτεινα φροίμιον τόδε·
τὰ δ' ἐς τὸ σὸν φρόνημα, μέμνημαι κλύων·
καὶ φημὶ ταὐτὰ καὶ συνήγορόν μ' ἔχεις.
παύροις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ἐστι συγγενὲς τόδε,
φίλον τὸν εὐτυχοῦντ' ἄνευ φθόνων σέβειν·

813. *πάγας.* 822. *ταῦτα.*

---

purposes of religion and luxury: this idea has coloured the picture here.—Hence the suggestion **θυηλαὶ** *censers* (Hermann), but by this what is gained to the figure in consistency is lost in picturesque force.

812. *For all this there must be paid to the gods a memorable return, even as the fine is great, which our wrath hath taken.* **ταγὰς** M. Schmidt. The form of the sentence, 'we should pay largely, since a great (...) *also* we have exacted', demands some word signifying 'payment exacted'. *ταγή* (extant in other senses) is here an archaic synonym of *τάξις*, an 'assessment', or 'payment imposed', as by a victor upon the conquered, from *τάσσειν* 'to prescribe'. The abstract nouns in *-σις*, answering to the aorist in *-σα*, steadily encroached in common use upon the abstracts in *-η*, corresponding to the strong aorist; but in the older language **λαβή, λάχη** etc. were used with the same freedom as in the later **λῆψις, λῆξις** etc. They were simply the abstract nouns answering to the verbs and admitted the same range of meaning.—*πάγας...ἐφραξάμεσθα* Hermann *we fenced a snare.*—*ὑπερκόπους* Heath.

815. **Ἀργεῖον δάκος**: the 'foal of the horse' would not usually be described as *δάκος*, but the expression comes down from the time when the *Argive horse* inspired the strange terror depicted in the *Seven against Thebes* (see the Introduction to that play, § 2). The legends of the mares of Augeas and Diomede, which were fed on human flesh, is a similar testimony to the formidable renown of the horse of the north.

816. **ἵππου νεοσσός** may perhaps allude to the wooden horse and the soldiers who came out of its belly; but this does not well account for the description of the Argive people generally as 'the foal of the horse'. More probably both the *horse* here and the *lion* of *v.* 818 are emblematic animals, perhaps heraldic. The horse was certainly characteristic of Argos, and according to the Argive legends was created there by Poseidon. The lion on the other hand would belong rather (as witness the gates)

and from the expiring ash is breathed a reek of richness. For all this there must be paid to the gods a memorable return, even as the fine is great, which our wrath hath taken, since for one woman stolen a city hath been laid level by the fierce beast of Argos, the foal of the horse, the folk of the shield, that launched himself with a leap in the season of the Pleiads' fall. Over the wall he sprang and, like a lion fleshed, lapped his fill of proud princes' blood.

Now, having given to religion this ample precedence, I come to thee and thy feelings. I remember what I have heard. I am with thee, and support thine accusation. Rare among men are they to whom it is natural to love and admire the fortunate

---

to Mycenae. Aeschylus has perhaps combined types belonging to different layers of legend. In Eur. *Supp.* 1223 the sons of *The Seven*, who under the name of the *Epigoni* avenged their fathers upon Thebes, are called *ἐκτεθραμμένοι σκύμνοι λεόντων*, but it does not appear whether this description is applied to them specially as *Argives*. See Paley's note.

ib. **ἀσπιδηστρόφος λεώς.** On the shield of Argos and the Argives see *Theb.* 89 and the Introduction to that play p. xxii. The title points to a time when in metal work, especially armour, the Achaeans of the Argolid were much in advance of their neighbours.—For *-στροφος* (*wielders* of the shield) Wecklein refers to Soph. *Ai.* 575 *διὰ πολυρράφου στρέφων πόρπακος ἑπτάβοιον ἄρρηκτον σάκος.*

817. **ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν** *i.e.* in late autumn, early in November. "The time (Klausen observes) is mentioned which would best account for the storm before described, since between the setting and the rising of the Pleiads it was not the sailing season; see Theocr. 13. 25, and Hesiod. *Opp.* 617. Demosthenes (p. 1214) speaks of the tempests which usually followed the former event". Paley. See the Introduction.—On the interpretation 'at midnight' see Appendix P.

819. **αἵματος τυραννικοῦ**: an expression significant to some of his hearers.

820. **θεοῖς μὲν ἐξέτεινα**: 'so far my first word to the *gods*, which I have not scanted'. See *v.* 907.

821. **τὰ...φρόνημα** *but as to the matter of your own feelings* (see *vv.* 776—800).—**μέμνημαι κλύων** *I remember what I have heard*, that is, intimations of the disaffection at home which had reached him before his return and on his first landing. That he should have heard something would naturally be supposed, and is in fact required to account for his bearing. This allusion gives the key. (We need not suppose him to mean that he remembers what was said a few minutes ago.)

822. **συνήγορόν μ' ἔχεις** *you have in me a supporter of your accusation*, a *συνήγορον* in the narrower sense of the term (see L. and Sc. *s.v.*). Not merely 'agreeing with you'. What the elders have spoken is an accusation, not the less menacing because general, against their compatriots (see particularly *vv.* 798—800). The king declares himself on their side, determined to investigate and to punish (*v.* 839), and his threats do not fall to the ground.

824. **φίλον**: a predicate: *φίλον σέβειν to admire kindly.*—**φθόνων** *envious feelings, envying*, inclination to envy. The plural *φθόνοι* makes a class-term 'what

δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὸς καρδίαν προσήμενος
ἄχθος διπλοΐζει τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον,
τοῖς τ' αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ πήμασιν βαρύνεται
καὶ τὸν θυραῖον ὄλβον εἰσορῶν στένει.
εἰδὼς λέγοιμ' ἄν· εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι
ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἴδωλον σκιᾶς,
δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρευμενεῖς ἐμοί.
μόνος δ' Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἑκὼν ἔπλει,
ζευχθεὶς ἕτοιμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος·
εἴτ' οὖν θανόντος εἴτε καὶ ζῶντος πέρι
λέγω. τὰ δ' ἄλλα πρὸς πόλιν τε καὶ θεοὺς
κοινοὺς ἀγῶνας θέντες ἐν πανηγύρει
βουλευσόμεσθα. καὶ τὸ μὲν καλῶς ἔχον
ὅπως χρονίζον εὖ μενεῖ βουλευτέον·
ὅτῳ δὲ καὶ δεῖ φαρμάκων παιωνίων,
ἤτοι κέαντες ἢ τεμόντες εὐφρόνως
πειρασόμεθα πήματος τρέψαι νόσον.
νῦν δ' ἐς μέλαθρα καὶ δόμους ἐφεστίους
ἐλθὼν θεοῖσι πρῶτα δεξιώσομαι,
οἵπερ πρόσω πέμψαντες ἤγαγον πάλιν.
νίκη δ' ἐπείπερ ἕσπετ', ἐμπέδως μένοι.

826. *πεπαμμένω.*

---

is like envy', as in Plato, *Philebus* 40 E *περὶ φόβων καὶ θυμῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων.—φθόνου* h, *ψόγου* Stobaeus.

826. **τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον** *him that has aught amiss with him.* *νόσον* covers both *distress* and *vice.*—**πεπαμένῳ** Porson.

830. **ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον** *the mirror of friendship, i.e.* the false friendship which is to the genuine as the reflexion to the reality, or, as he puts it with angry exaggeration, as the reflexion of a shadow to the shadow itself.—**δοκοῦντας**: the example (the pretended friends of Agamemnon) is put in apposition to the general conception which it illustrates.—All this, though ostensibly directed against the absent, and in this aspect forcibly exhibiting the character of the man, is full of menace for those about him: *δοκοῦντας εἶναι* refers expressly to *v.* 780.

832. **ὅσπερ κτλ.** If you would have good service from men, you must ride them hard. Such is the suggested moral. —Odysseus was entrapped by Palamedes into accompanying the expedition.

834. **εἴτ' οὖν...λέγω.** *λέγω* is properly a separate clause in itself; with *εἴτ' οὖν... πέρι* another *λέγω* is supplied; *that I will say for him, living or dead.*—Another unhappy remark. It is not the moment

without envying. The poison of ill-will settles to the heart and doubles the load of him that has aught amiss: at once his own sorrows press upon him, and he sighs to see the other's happiness. I may speak with knowledge, having learnt thoroughly that mirror of friendship, image of a shadow, the hypocrites' semblance of devotion to me. Odysseus only, Odysseus, who joined the fleet against his will, I found, being once in harness, mine own right horse. That I will say for him living or dead.

[*Enter* CLYTAEMNESTRA.]

And for the rest, the affairs of state and of religion too in general assembly summoned together we will debate; where we must take such counsel that what is well may endure so and abide, while as for what must have medicinal remedy, we will do our kind endeavour with lancet or cautery to defeat the mischief of the sore.

For the moment, I go to mine house and private chambers, where my hand's first greeting must be to the gods, who sent me forth and have brought me back. May victory, as she hath attended me, constantly abide with me still!

---

to remind the people, especially without a word of sympathy, that after all the losses of the war most of the returning army has probably perished at sea.

836. **ἀγῶνας**: ἀγοράς, *meetings*.

839. **ὅτῳ δὲ καὶ δεῖ.** ὅτῳ is neuter, *what must have remedy*, answering to τὸ καλῶς ἔχον. What 'kind lancet or cautery' may be needed, to remove the peccant humours of the body politic, will not be spared. With εὐφρόνως compare Antony's ironical question to the murderers of Caesar, 'Who else must be let blood, who else is rank?'

841. **πήματος τρέψαι νόσον** *to defeat the mischief of the sore*, or (as Porson) **πῆμ' ἀποστρέψαι νόσου** *to avert the harm of the ailment.* The MS. reading is not impossible. **νόσον πήματος** *the ailment* or *mischief of the sore.* For πῆμα see Soph. *Ai.* 582 τομῶν πῆμα, a tumour that 'craves the knife'. *The metaphor, as the previous line shows, is from surgery not from medicine.* **τρέψαι** *to defeat* (see τροπή) is a metaphor within a metaphor, falling back in the direction of the literal. When the king speaks of 'lancing or cauterizing' the state, what he really means is that with the support of his friends he will 'defeat' his enemies and theirs. It is natural therefore that the word *defeat* should come into his mind.

843 points to the 'lustration' and Clytaemnestra's bath.

845. Significant again. He is aware that ἔτ' εἴσ' ἀγῶνες, that he has still enemies to encounter at home.—The last part of the speech is vividly dramatic. All the auditors are agreed that τὸ καλῶς ἔχον ὅπως χρονίζον εὖ μενεῖ βουλευτέον (cf. *v.* 362), and on the necessity of 'surgery' for the good of the state, only there is a difference of opinion as to the sense of these expressions. The king speaks as he does because, not having a glimpse of the plot, he believes himself irresistible and gives the rein to his indignation.

ΚΛ. ἄνδρες πολῖται, πρέσβος Ἀργείων τόδε,
οὐκ αἰσχυνοῦμαι τοὺς φιλάνορας τρόπους
λέξαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐν χρόνῳ δ' ἀποφθίνει
τὸ τάρβος ἀνθρώποισιν. οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα
μαθοῦσ' ἐμαυτῆς δύσφορον λέξω βίον
τοσόνδ' ὅσονπερ οὗτος ἦν ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ.
τὸ μὲν γυναῖκα πρῶτον ἄρσενος δίχα
ἧσθαι δόμοις ἔρημον ἔκπαγλον κακόν,
πολλὰς κλύουσαν ἡδονὰς παλιγκότους...
καὶ τὸν μὲν ἥκειν τὸν δ' ἐπεισφέρειν κακοῦ
κάκιον ἄλλο πῆμα λάσκοντας δόμοις.
καὶ τραυμάτων μὲν εἰ τόσων ἐτύγχανεν
ἀνὴρ ὅδ', ὡς πρὸς οἶκον ὠχετεύετο
φάτις, τέτρηται δικτύου πλέω λέγειν·
εἰ δ' ἦν τεθνηκώς, ὡς ἐπλήθυνον λόγοι,
τρισώματός τἂν Γηρυὼν ὁ δεύτερος
πολλὴν—ἄνωθεν, τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω—

859. *φάσϊς* (?) *τέτρωται.*

---

846. As the king makes to enter, the queen attended by her women (*v.* 899) comes from the palace. Her address, like her message by the herald, is a self-defence, better prepared but not more successful. The very depth of her respect (she says) prevents her from addressing the king, so she turns to the assembly and principally to the elders, with whom long association has made her familiar.

849. **οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα μαθοῦσα** 'my own witness to my conduct will not be hearsay, such as that by which I am perhaps accused'.

852. **ἄρσενος...ἔρημον** *alone without the man fill the throne of the house* (cf. *v.* 271) bearing the weight of the sole responsibility. See also next note.

854. *Hearing many persistent flatteries*, *i.e.* besieged by tempters. **ἡδονὰς** *douceurs*, compliments, *πρὸς ἡδονὴν λεγόμενα*, 'what is spoken to please'. Herodotus (7. 101 *κότερα ἀληθηίῃ χρήσομαι ἢ ἡδονῇ; shall I use frankness or flattery?*) has the word in a sense nearly approaching this. It properly meant *sweetness*, *agreeableness* or *something agreeable* like the French equivalent. **παλιγκότους**: unwelcome but irrepressible.—Clytaemnestra just glances at the firmness of her virtue. Then, feeling the peril of the subject, she passes rapidly to another, and presently (*v.* 865) contrives to bring in her words again with a slight but transfigurating change, *as if it were* **κληδόνας**, *and not really* **ἡδονὰς** *at all, which she had said*, precisely as in *v.* 866 she twists to a new meaning the words of *v.* 862. In both places the explanation is the same. At this last fearful crisis she really is afraid of her own words and unable for some minutes to steady her mind.—*κληδόνας* Auratus. Others more plausibly omit the verse.

855. *While one comer after another brought to the house loud tidings of woe*

Clytaemnestra. Townsmen of Argos, her noblest present here, what love I have practised toward my husband, my modesty will let me declare to *you*. With time men lose their fear.

Upon no witness but mine own I can say, how weary were my days all the long while my lord lay before Ilium. A sore grief it is in itself, for a woman without a man to sit in the empty throne of the house, with ever persistent flatteries at her ear,...and one coming after another with loud tidings of woe to the house each worse than the last. As for wounds, if my lord was wounded as often as the conduits of fame brought news of it, he hath holes in him more in number than a net. And had he died, as report thereof multipled, he might, with three bodies like another Geryon, have boasted many times three—not beds,

---

each worse than the last. **τὸν μὲν ἥκειν τὸν δ' ἐπεισφέρειν.** See *vv.* 360 and 575 for this separation into an explicit antithesis of what in English would be presented as one compound notion. Literally it is 'that one should be arrived and another bring in addition', *i.e.* 'that the arriving of one (messenger) should be followed by the bringing' etc. Our habit would expect (see Paley) *τὸν μὲν ἥκειν φέροντα κακόν, τὸν δὲ κάκιον ἄλλο ἐπεισφέρειν.*—**ἐπεισφρεῖναι** Wecklein, *i.e.* 'that each new crier of disastrous news *should be let in* by his predecessor, so quickly they followed' (see *εἰσφρέω*), is forcible, and would probably appear in our MS. as *ἐπεισφέρειν*. But is it not more natural that *τὸν μέν* should be the *first* comer, *τὸν δέ* the *second*?

858. **ὠχετεύετο**: rumour 'came in by channels'.

859. **τέτρηται** Ahrens (see *τείρω, τρῆμα*). A net has 'holes' but not 'wounds'. —**πλέω λέγειν** 'more to count' *i.e. in number.*—"The cold-blooded phrase suits Klytaemnestra" and is the more horrible as suggesting a vision of the sequel.

860. *ἐπλήθυον* Porson, as the regular form. But see *θαρσύνω*.

860—64. He might have boasted many times as many burials as a three-bodied Geryon, who died once in each shape. For 'burial' she uses the phrase 'to cloak oneself in earth', *γῆν ἐπιέσσασθαι* Theogn. 429, Homer *Il.* 3. 57.—(**ἄνωθεν, τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω**) *meaning the coverlet merely; I say nothing of the bed.* *ἡ κάτω χλαῖνα*, in relation to the figure of burial, would be the earth *on* which the dead lay, as opposed to the earth laid upon him (Wecklein compares *Theb.* 931 *ὑπὸ δὲ σώματι γᾶς πλοῦτος ἄβυσσος ἔσται*). "The confused expression marks the disturbance in Clytaemnestra's thoughts". Her tongue trips, or rather the pressure of her secret makes her fear that it has tripped, and in trying to safeguard herself she makes the matter worse. The mention of the 'net', of the 'wounds' and 'burial', is to her so frightfully significant that she doubts for a moment, without reason but naturally, whether it will not raise suspicion in others. She therefore tries to disarm the reference to burial, 'when I say mantle of earth, I mean just *mantle* upon him; I could not think of his last *bed*'. This is nonsense, but perhaps none the worse for that. In the same spirit immediately afterwards (*v.* 866) she makes upon this *πολλὴν ἄνωθεν* a sort of forced and far-fetched play. Even Clytaemnestra for a moment is nervous and not mistress of her speech.—*τὴν κατωγαίου λέχους* Tucker, *Class. Rev.* XI. p. 404.

χθονὸς τρίμοιρον χλαῖναν ἐξηύχει λαβών,
ἅπαξ ἑκάστῳ κατθανὼν μορφώματι.
τοιῶνδ' ἕκατι κληδόνων παλιγκότων
πολλὰς ἄνωθεν ἀρτάνας ἐμῆς δέρης
ἔλυσαν ἄλλοι πρὸς βίαν λελιμμένης.
ἐκ τῶνδέ τοι παῖς ἐνθάδ' οὐ παραστατεῖ,
ἐμῶν τε καὶ σῶν κύριος πιστευμάτων,
ὡς χρῆν, Ὀρέστης· μηδὲ θαυμάσῃς τόδε.
τρέφει γὰρ αὐτὸν εὐμενὴς δορύξενος
Στρόφιος ὁ Φωκεύς, ἀμφίλεκτα πήματα
ἐμοὶ προφωνῶν, τόν θ' ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ σέθεν
κίνδυνον, εἴ τε δημόθρους ἀναρχία
βουλὴν καταρρίψειεν, ὥστε σύγγονον
βροτοῖσι τὸν πεσόντα λακτίσαι πλέον.
τοιάδε μέντοι σκῆψις οὐ δόλον φέρει.

867. λελημμένης.

---

863. **ἐξηύχει λαβών**: 'he might have boasted a triple mantle of earth *assumed*'. λαβών literally 'having taken it on him'.—λαβεῖν Paley.

865. **παλιγκότων** *persistent*. See on *vv.* 576, 854.

866. **πολλὰς ἄνωθεν ἀρτάνας** *many a hanging noose*: ἀρτάνη properly 'thing suspending', 'that by which something is hung (ἤρτηται)', like other quasi-verbal nouns can take an adverb construed with the implied verbal notion: ἄνωθεν ἀρτάνη literally 'a thing which *hangs up*'. But the expression is cumbrous, and due only to the artificial parallel with πολλὴν ἄνωθεν: see on *v.* 862.—**δέρης** '*from* my neck', ἔλυσαν taking the construction of ἀπέλυσαν.

867. **πρὸς βίαν λελιμμένης** (ἐμοῦ), *preventing my eagerness, i.e.* my desperate desire to die, literally 'in despite of me eager'. (Ahrens, Blomfield.) Cf. *Theb.* 367 μάχης λελιμμένος, and λίπτομαι. In *Theb.* 342 λελημμένοι is written for λελιμμένοι.—Of two proposed renderings for πρὸς βίαν λελημμένης, (1), supplying ἐμοῦ, 'of me violently seized (by them)' would require "ληφθείσης the *act*, not λελημμένης the state" (S.), and (2), supplying δέρης, 'my neck, caught violently in the noose', gives λαβεῖν a forced meaning.

868. The manner in which Clytaemnestra uses this circumstance, the absence of her son Orestes, is skilful. Here at least, she says, there can be no doubt of her honesty (*τοιάδε σκῆψις οὐ δόλον φέρει*): if she had been disloyal to the king, she would never have sent his heir out of her control. The argument is sound; the flaw is in the assumed facts, as to which she trusts that the king is not yet informed. The true facts about Orestes, as supposed by Aeschylus, have to be gathered from indications, for us slight and obscure, in the *Choephori*; see the Introduction to that play pp. xiv foll.

869. **ἐμῶν...πιστευμάτων** *who should best make confidence between me and thee.* Κύριος followed by a genitive signifies 'having power over', or 'qualified in' the

but coverlets rather of earth taken on to him, if he had had one death for each of his shapes. Such, ever present at mine ear, were the rumours that put me many times to the hanging noose, which others, preventing my eagerness, loosened from my neck.

This is indeed why the boy Orestes, he who might best make confidence between thee and me, is not, as he should be, here; be not surprised. He is in the special care of our ally, Strophius of Phocis, who warned me of double mischief, the danger first of thee before Ilium, and the chance that noisy rebellion from below might risk a plot against us, as it is native to man to spurn the more him that is down. The excuse however is such as cannot have guile in it.

---

matter described. See L. and Sc. *s. v.* Thus **κύριος πιστευμάτων** is literally 'qualified in the matter of confidence', 'powerful over confidence', where *πίστευμα confidence* is the abstract from *πιστεύειν to trust.*—*πιστωμάτων pledges* Spanheim, Hermann. Orestes was himself a *πίστωμα* between his parents, but being a *πίστωμα* he was *κύριος πιστευμάτων*. The proper meaning of *κύριος πιστωμάτων* would be 'qualified to give a pledge', 'qualified to deal with a pledge', or the like.

871. **αὐτὸν**: perhaps an example of this pronoun used without emphasis, which in Aeschylus is rare. But an emphasis is possible '*he* is under the *special* (separate) care'.

872. **ἀμφίλεκτα...προφωνῶν** *suggesting to me future trouble in two shapes.* **ἀμφίλεκτα** properly 'divided into two counts' in the sense of 'heads' or 'divisions' in a subject, as in the technical phrase '*counts* of an indictment'. (So also Wecklein.)

873. **τόν τε...εἴ τε.** These are *two* dangers, not parts of the same: (1) Agamemnon might die at Troy, in which case his youthful heir would need protection; (2) his mere absence and the weakness of the regency might encourage the unruly 'to risk a plot'. To the last enterprise especially the impossibility of seizing the heir would be a discouragement.

875. **βουλὴν καταρρίψειεν** *should hazard a plot against* (*κατά*) *me*; Blomfield. Cf. *ῥίπτειν κίνδυνον*, a metaphor from the throwing of dice, *ῥίπτειν κύβευμα*. For *βουλή*, cf. Andocides 9. 4 *διὰ ταῦτα εἶπον τῇ βουλῇ* (I told *the council*) *ὅτι εἰδείην τοὺς ποιήσοντας, καὶ ἐξήλεγξα τὰ γενόμενα, ὅτι εἰσηγήσατο μὲν πινόντων ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν βουλὴν* (proposed *this plot*) *Εὐφίλητος, ἀντεῖπον δὲ ἐγώ κτλ.*, a passage which shows that this sense was not affected by the technical use of *ἡ βουλή* at Athens. *ῥῖψαι βουλήν* for *ῥῖψαι κίνδυνον βουλῆς* is an extension of the 'inner' or cognate accusative.—Others translate 'should throw down *the* council', *i.e.* overthrow the government of the queen and her advisers, but (1) *βουλή* without explanation could not bear this technical meaning; (2) the play does not give the explanation, nor suppose a formal *Council* of regency; the elders never speak of themselves as such; (3) we should expect rather *καταλῦσαι* or possibly *καταβαλεῖν*.—*βουλὴν καταρράψειεν* Scaliger, 'should *devise* a plot'.—**ὥστε**: *ὡς, as indeed.*

877. **μέντοι** *however*; 'though his presence would be our best assurance, the explanation of his absence is transparently honest and an assurance in itself'.

ἔμοιγε μὲν δὴ κλαυμάτων ἐπίσσυτοι
πηγαὶ κατεσβήκασιν, οὐδ᾽ ἔνι σταγών.
ἐν ὀψικοίτοις δ᾽ ὄμμασιν κλάβας† ἔχω,
τὰς ἀμφί σοι κλαίουσα λαμπτηρουχίας
ἀτημελήτους αἰέν. ἐν δ᾽ ὀνείρασιν
λεπταῖς ὑπαὶ κώνωπος ἐξηγειρόμην
ῥιπαῖσι θωΰσσοντος, ἀμφί σοι πάθη
ὁρῶσα πλείω τοῦ ξυνεύδοντος χρόνου.
νῦν ταῦτα πάντα τλᾶσ᾽, ἀπενθήτῳ φρενί,
λέγοιμ᾽ ἂν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα,
σωτῆρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς στέγης
στῦλον ποδήρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί,
καὶ γῆν φανεῖσαν ναυτίλοις παρ᾽ ἐλπίδα,
κάλλιστον ἦμαρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χείματος,
ὁδοιπόρῳ διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος—
τερπνὸν δὲ τἀναγκαῖον ἐκφυγεῖν ἅπαν·

889 *στόλον.*

---

878. **μὲν δή** dismissing irrelevancies and coming to the gist of the matter.

880. **βλάβας** Triclinius (*Cod. Farn.*) obviously and perhaps rightly, but **κλάβας** *eye-sores* cannot be disproved. The representation of the *F* by *β* is in the Doric and Aeolic dialects frequent and regular (φάβος = φάϝος, ὤβεα = ὤϝεα ᾠά etc.). From κλαϝ- (cf. κλαῦμα) a regular formation in these dialects would be κλάβ-α. The language of poetry often preserves dialectic forms, because the words came into literature from a dialectic source. A similar instance is νεβρός, commonly referred to the root (νεϝ-) of νέος. The nouns in -η from verb-stems, originally abstracts, describing a process, are regularly extended to the *effect* of the process, *e.g.* πλοκή *plaiting, wreath*, δίκη *pointing, way*, etc.: and κλάβα therefore might be the *sore* produced in running eyes.—γλάμας Platt, *Class. Rev.* XI. p. 95.

881. **τὰς ἀμφί σοι...λαμπτηρουχίας.** From the analogy of other like words (δᾳδουχία, λαμπαδουχία etc.) we should suppose that λαμπτηρουχία was the *function* of λαμπτηροῦχοι or *torch-bearers* and ἡ ἀμφί τινι λαμπτηρουχία *attendance upon a person as a torch-bearer*. Many words of this type, *e.g.* σκηπτοῦχος, κληδοῦχος, εὐνοῦχος, describe *offices* and *officers*. Here it seems to mean 'attending the king with torches' to his chamber, the *deductio*, as a state-ceremony. **ἀτημελήτους**, *neglected*, would, as applied to a ceremony, mean 'disused'. The queen wept that the king came no more with the accustomed state to his chamber.—Other explanations offered are (1) that the beacons (*v.* 293) were neglected, *i.e.* not lit, for want of cause to light them, (2) that the watch-fires lighted in the house in expectation of the king's return 'were disregarded', *i.e.* he did not come (Sidgwick), (3) that Clytaemnestra's lamp (really lit for Aegisthus) did not bring back her husband (Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XVII. 244).

But as for me, the fountains of my tears have run themselves dry, and there is no drop there. With watching late mine eyes are sore, with weeping for thine attendance of torch-bearers neglected still. The droning gnat with lightest flutter would wake me from dreams, in which I saw thee pass through more than the time of my sleep.

Now, after all this misery, in the relief of my soul, I would hail this my husband as a watch-dog to the fold, the ship's securing stay, the high roof's grounded pillar, as a child sole-born to a father hopeless, or land espied by mariners in despair, dawn as it looks most beautiful after storm, a flowing spring to the thirsty wayfarer,—but everywhere escape from distress is

---

But do these adequately render λαμπτηρουχία?

883. **λεπταῖς**, emphasized by displacement in the sentence, *lightest*.—**ὑπαὶ κώνωπος** together; **ῥιπαῖσι** with *θωύσσοντος*. The construction of *ὑπὸ* with dative of agent is not certified in Aeschylus (Wecklein mentions *Theb.* 915, but justly holds that that case is distinguishable).

885. **τοῦ...χρόνου** *i.e.* the time of my sleeping. "The personifying instinct pervades the language of Aeschylus" (Sidgwick).

886. **ἀπενθήτῳ** is distinguishable from *ἀπενθής*. The passive form, in its full force, means 'relieved from grief' (*disgriefed* so to speak, 'made *ἀπενθής*').

887. **τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα**, literally 'of the fold a dog', *i.e. what a dog is to the fold.* The article should in strictness have been repeated throughout the catalogue, *τῶν μὲν σταθμῶν κύνα, τῆς δὲ ναὸς πρότονον, τῆς δὲ στέγης στῦλον, κτλ.*, and so a prose-writer would have written. But in poetry the logical completeness of this is naturally sacrificed to euphony: with *σωτῆρα ναὸς πρότονον* we supply *τῆς ναός*, and so on.

889. **στῦλον**. M had probably the mis-spelling *στοῖλον*.—*στύλον* h.

890. **καὶ** "connects 887—889, which describe the *protection* and *security* afforded by the master, with 890—892, which describe the delight of his unhoped-for return. The transition from one set to the other is marked by *καί*". Sidgwick.—Mr S. J. Rowton suggests to me as a simpler explanation that **καὶ** couples only **γῆν** and **τέκνον**, joined because **φανεῖσαν παρ' ἐλπίδα** belongs to both, 'an only child coming to a despairing father, or land appearing to despairing sailors'. So also Dr Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XVII. 244) comparing Pind. *Ol.* 10. 86 *χρόνῳ μὲν φάνεν, ἀλλ' ὥτε παῖς...πατρὶ ποθεινὸς κτλ.* I adopt this.—This artificial catalogue betrays the speaker, as indeed does most of the oration. No one could make a successful speech in such a situation, though it is natural enough that the queen should try. As the king severely and truly remarks, she is much too long. But she attains the real object of her appearance before the palace, when he is compelled to accept the perfidious compliment of the tapestry.

891. *Dawn as it looks the fairest, after storm.* The superlative, though much criticized, seems correct.

893—4. Literally 'but relief is sweet in everything; *such like* then are the titles with which I express my praise', *i.e.* 'as the types of deliverance, such as the foregoing, are infinite in number, I take them in the sum and mean them all'. The cardinal point is the emphasis on *τοιοῖσδε*, emphasized in respect of its difference from *τοῖσδε*. The queen's

τοιοῖσδέ τοίνυν ἀξιῶ προσφθέγμασιν.
φθόνος δ' ἀπέστω· πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ πρὶν κακὰ
ἠνειχόμεσθα. νῦν δέ μοι, φίλον κάρα,
ἔκβαιν' ἀπήνης τῆσδε, μὴ χαμαὶ τιθεὶς
τὸν σὸν πόδ', ὦναξ, Ἰλίου πορθήτορα.
δμωαί, τί μέλλεθ', αἷς ἐπέσταλται τέλος
πέδον κελεύθου στρωννύναι πετάσμασιν;
εὐθὺς γενέσθω πορφυρόστρωτος πόρος,
ἐς δῶμ' ἄελπτον ὡς ἂν ἡγῆται δίκη.
τὰ δ' ἄλλα φροντὶς οὐχ ὕπνῳ νικωμένη
θήσει, δικαίως (σὺν θεοῖς) εἱμαρμένα.

ΑΓ. Λήδας γένεθλον, δωμάτων ἐμῶν φύλαξ,
ἀπουσίᾳ μὲν εἶπας εἰκότως ἐμῇ·

898. *ἄναξ.*

---

copiousness, as is the danger of unreal eloquence, has overrun itself and reached a point at which it is equally ineffective to go on or to stop. With *πηγαῖον ῥέος* her catalogue is in no way rounded off, and yet one or two more *προσφθέγματα* would carry her over the edge of the sublime. Perforce therefore she generalizes, and concludes in fact with an *et cetera.* Thus a fine piece of verse is spoiled, but it was made for the purpose. Aeschylus could afford to purchase a piece of truth at the cost of a few big words.—**ἀξιῶ**: 'to hold in value', then 'to pronounce valuable', and so, as here, 'to praise, honour', both of things and persons, cf. Eur. *Or.* 1210 *καλοῖσιν ὑμεναίοισιν ἀξιουμένη*, *Hec.* 319. The verb is used, as any transitive verb may be, absolutely; see *e.g. v.* 1182 *φρενώσω δ' οὐκέτ' ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων my teaching shall be no longer enigmatic*; so here, *my praise bestows titles like these.* But in effect the object is *ἄνδρα τόνδε* supplied from the foregoing period (*v.* 887) of which this line is really a part.—See further Appendix Q.

895. **φθόνος δ' ἀπέστω**, *i.e.* the excess of my joy, after what I have suffered, does not deserve rebuke. According to Greek religious feeling the display of human happiness was itself a provocation to fortune.

896. At a sign from the queen the path to the house is strown with crimson embroidered tapestries, properly used for religious processions and ceremonies, over which the king is invited to walk. The urgency of Clytaemnestra in forcing him to accept this homage has a motive more direct and simple than the chance of exposing him to the jealousy of Fate. It is designed for the people, upon whose conduct in a few minutes the lives of the queen and her partisans will depend. To stimulate discontent and discourage loyalty is of vital moment. By the queen's arrangement, what the murmuring spectators see is that the returned *τύραννος* enters his palace with a kind of pomp shocking to Hellenic eyes (see on *v.* 938). His reluctance, even if taken for genuine, could be appreciated only by the immediate bystanders. It is like Gracchus pointing to his head, only that in this case the ill effect is designed. To Aeschylus the scene may perhaps have

sweet; in *such-like* titles then would my praising run. And let jealousy refrain, seeing how much was the woe we endured before.

But now, I pray thee, beloved, step from this car—but not on the earth, king, set that foot of thine, which has humbled Troy. Slaves, why delay ye to do your commanded office, and strow the ground of his way with coverings? In a moment let the laid path be turned to purple, that to a home unexpected he may have conduct due.

'And for the rest', a vigilance never laid asleep shall order it as just providence, I trust, intends.

Ag. Daughter of Leda, who hast my house in charge, if to the measure of my absence thou hast stretched the length of

---

been suggested by the fate of Pausanias, one of whose gravest offences was his adoption of Oriental ceremony.

898. **τὸν σὸν πόδ'.** Elision of substantives and adjectives having the quantity ⏑ ⏑ is rare in tragic verse, and by Aeschylus and Sophocles scarcely allowed except under peculiar conditions. Their regular use is as in *v.* 887 *κύνα*, *v.* 895 *κακά*. As to the details see *Journal of Philology* XII. p. 136. The exceptions are about 3 *per cent.* In the iambic verse of Aeschylus this is the only one sufficiently attested. (On *P. V.* 355 *δώσειν Δί'*, and *Eum.* 902 *κατὰ χθόν' οὖσα*, see the article cited.) What justifies it to the ear will appear to be this, that in the phrase *τὸν σὸν πόδα* following *χαμαὶ τιθεὶς* the noun, being anticipated and so to speak 'discounted', has no weight, while on the other hand what is lost by curtailment to *πόδα* goes to increase the stress upon *σόν*, on which the meaning depends,—*that foot, O king, which thou hast set upon Troy.*

902. **ἀελπτον...δίκη** with ironic intention, meaning ostensibly *scarce hoped for ...due ceremony*, but for those informed *unexpected...vengeance.*

903. **φροντὶς οὐχ ὕπνῳ νικωμένη** an expression not lost upon those privy to the secret of the queen's night-watch. Ostensibly it is a compliment to the 'open eyes' of the king, and *τὰ δ' ἄλλα* in fact recalls the conclusion of his speech (*v.* 835), which she hears as she enters.

ib. Literally 'shall order it, being, I trust, justly fated', an expression of pious reliance upon heaven to show the right in the king's threatened investigation. So the words should be grouped, if the reading is right.—*θεοῖσιν ἄρμενα* Meineke, Wecklein, where *θήσει ἄρμενα* is 'shall order them fitly'.

905. Agamemnon dismisses the queen's salutation with a sarcasm, and sternly rebukes her for the untimely pomp, of which he divines the malicious motive (*v.* 912). Of his danger he has not a glimpse, nor does it lie in any of the facts which he knows or suspects, but in the undiscovered plot and preparations of the conspirators. See the Introduction.—**Λήδας γένεθλον**: a significant opening. Clytaemnestra was the daughter of one false wife and the sister of another, and her husband, who calls her by no other name or title but this, neither 'wife', nor 'queen', nor even 'Clytaemnestra', gives her to know that he has not forgotten the fact. Cf. Ov. *Her.* 16. 291 (Paris to Helen) *vix fieri, si sunt vires in semine avorum, | et Iovis et Ledae filia, casta potes.* Euripides (if it be he,

μακρὰν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας· ἀλλ' ἐναισίμως
αἰνεῖν, παρ' ἄλλων χρὴ τόδ' ἔρχεσθαι γέρας.
καὶ τἄλλα μὴ γυναικὸς ἐν τρόποις ἐμὲ
ἅβρυνε, μηδὲ βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην
χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα προσχάνῃς ἐμοί,
μηδ' εἵμασι στρώσασ' ἐπίφθονον πόρον
τίθει· θεούς τοι τοῖσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεών,
ἐν ποικίλοις δὲ θνητὸν ὄντα κάλλεσιν
βαίνειν ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἄνευ φόβου.
λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, σέβειν ἐμέ.
χωρὶς ποδοψήστρων τε καὶ τῶν ποικίλων
κληδὼν ἀυτεῖ· καὶ τὸ μὴ κακῶς φρονεῖν
θεοῦ μέγιστον δῶρον. ὀλβίσαι δὲ χρὴ
βίον τελευτήσαντ' ἐν εὐεστοῖ φίλῃ.
εἰ πάντα δ' ὣς πράσσοιμ' ἂν εὐθαρσὴς ἐγώ.

ΚΛ. καὶ μὴν τόδ' εἰπέ, μὴ παρὰ γνώμην, ἐμοί,—
ΑΓ. γνώμην μὲν ἴσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ' ἐμέ.
ΚΛ. ηὔξω θεοῖς δείσας ἂν ὧδ' ἔρδειν τάδε;

910. βαρβά$^{\rho}$θου.

Iph. A. 686) makes Agamemnon use the same title, among others, without special intention; but that he should select it at such a moment as this, and avoid every other, is not to be supposed accidental.

909. **ἐμὲ...ἐμοί**: '*me*, who have no taste for such things, however the habits of my house may have been changed for the worse in my absence'. See on *v.* 918.—**ἐν τρόποις**: ἐν of circumstance, *with*.

911. Literally 'make open-mouthed grovelling clamour in honour of me'.

913. **τίθει** with emphasis, 'do not *invite* jealousy'.

915. **ἐμοὶ μὲν** '*to me at least*'.

916. Ambiguous; 'I would have the honour of a man—*and husband*—not of a god'.

917. **τε καὶ**: 'without carpets for the feet as without *refinements generally*'.—**τῶν ποικίλων** includes both 'decoration' and 'subtlety, fraud'. The artificial phrase **τὰ ποικίλα** is chosen to bring out this malicious suggestion.

918. *Rumour cries loud*, another formidable phrase. Rumour sufficiently proclaims the glory of Agamemnon—and the modesty of his wife? She has dwelt on the κληδόνες that came from Troy (*v.* 865): what of the κληδών that went there? (Propertius, who has imitated this play elsewhere, seems to have had this passage in mind in 2. 18. 35 'ipse tuus semper tibi sit custodia lectus, | nec *nimis ornata fronte sedere* velis: | credam ego narranti, noli committere, *famae*: | *et terram rumor transilit et maria*'.)

921. 'And that I shall act on this principle *always* is the assurance for me', literally 'and *I* am confident inasmuch

thy address, still for a modest praise, the honour should proceed from some other lips. For the rest, offer no womanish luxuries to me, nor before me, as before a king of the East, grovel with open-mouthed acclaim, nor with vestures strown draw jealous eyes upon my path. To the gods these honours belong. To tread, a mortal, upon fair fineries is to my poor thoughts a thing of fear. Give me I say the worship not of thy god but of thy lord. No foot-cloths, no false refinements, need proclaim what rumour cries. An unpresumptuous mind is God's greatest gift: happy let him be called, who has come prosperously to the end. And that such will be ever my rule is the assurance for me.

Cl. Come answer, saving thy judgment, one question from me—

Ag. My judgment, be assured, is fixed beyond change by me.

Cl. Didst thou bind thyself belike, in some hour of terror, to this observance?

---

as I should do *all* things after this fashion'.—**εἰ πράσσοιμ' ἄν.** The optative with *ἄν*, standing in a conditional clause, has the same meaning that it would have in a principal sentence, *i.e.* it expresses what *would* happen or *is likely* to happen, under conditions expressed or implied. (It is grammatically an *apodosis.*) Here the implied condition is the universal condition 'whatever the circumstances', and is in fact contained in *πάντα*. See on *Theb.* 504.—**πράσσοιμ' ἄν** 'I should do' (Paley), not 'I should fare'.—**ὧς** *thus*, 'with the moderation and propriety that I show in this refusal'. The remark, or rather promise, is for the benefit of the bystanders.—I follow Mr Sidgwick in holding that this verse is correct. *εἶπον τάδ', ὡς* Weil.

922—933. On the effect of this altercation see Appendix R.

922—923. **καὶ μὴν** *see*, marks a new turn.—**τόδ' εἰπὲ...ἐμοί** differs from the usual formula for asking a question, *εἰπέ μοι*, only in the appealing emphasis thrown upon *ἐμοί*.—**τόδε**: the question (*v.* 924), which follows the king's interruption.—**μὴ παρὰ γνώμην**: literally 'not against judgment', an afterthought and parenthesis, as is shown by the imp. aor. *εἰπέ* (not subj. as required in prohibition). For *παρὰ γνώμην λέγειν* see Eur. *Med.* 577 *κεἰ παρὰ γνώμην ἐρῶ* *though it be an ill-judged thing to say.* The parenthesis here is thrown in just to get a hearing, and means 'you may, without sacrifice of judgment, answer a question'.—The alternative rendering, 'yet order this not contrary to my purpose', scarcely satisfies either *τόδ' εἰπέ* or *καὶ μήν*.—**γνώμην...μὴ διαφθεροῦντα** 'that I shall not alter my judgment (resolve) for the worse'. Eur. *Hipp.* 388 *ταῦτα...προγνοῦσ' ἐγώ, οὐ διαφθερεῖν ἔμελλον* (Paley).

924. *You vowed perhaps in some hour of terror so to perform this act? i.e.* to make a humble entrance, propitiating the gods by renunciation. She tries a taunt of cowardice (Sidgwick).—**ηὔξω... ἄν** 'you *must have* vowed': for this conjectural use of the past indicative with *ἄν* see on *Theb.* 696. The sentence is in

ΑΓ. εἴπερ τις, εἰδώς γ' εὖ τόδ' ἐξεῖπον τέλος.
ΚΛ. τί δ' ἂν δοκεῖ σοι Πρίαμος, εἰ τάδ' ἤνυσεν;
ΑΓ. ἐν ποικίλοις ἂν κάρτα μοι βῆναι δοκεῖ.
ΚΛ. μή νυν τὸν ἀνθρώπειον αἰδεσθῇς ψόγον.
ΑΓ. φήμη γε μέντοι δημόθρους μέγα σθένει.
ΚΛ. ὁ δ' ἀφθόνητός γ' οὐκ ἐπίζηλος πέλει.
ΑΓ. οὔτοι γυναικός ἐστιν ἱμείρειν μάχης.
ΚΛ. τοῖς δ' ὀλβίοις γε καὶ τὸ νικᾶσθαι πρέπει.
ΑΓ. ἦ καὶ σὺ νίκην τήνδε δήριος τίεις.
ΚΛ. πιθοῦ· κράτος μέν τοι πάρες γ' ἑκὼν ἐμοί.
ΑΓ. ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ σοι ταῦθ', ὑπαί τις ἀρβύλας
λύοι τάχος, πρόδουλον ἔμβασιν ποδός.—
καὶ τοῖσδέ μ' ἐμβαίνονθ' ἁλουργέσιν θεῶν
μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος βάλοι φθόνος.
πολλὴ γὰρ αἰδὼς σωματοφθορεῖν ποσὶν
φθείροντα πλοῦτον ἀργυρωνήτους θ' ὑφάς.

926 and 927. δοκῇ.

---

form a statement with interrogation.—**ἔρδειν**, properly of the performance of a ritual.—δείσασαν Hermann; 'have you vowed to the gods that I should make such a sacrifice (of costly decorations) only in fear of your life?'

925. **τέλος** *final decision.* He ignores her question.

926. **δοκεῖ** Stanley.—**τί** represents a verb to be filled in by the answer, ἐν ποικίλοις βῆναι. So in ἵνα τί; *with what object?* τί represents a verb in the subjunctive.—Priam is no argument; it is the king's very ground of objection that the ceremony is *βάρβαρον*. Clytaemnestra is merely talking down resistance.

928. **τὸν ἀνθρώπειον**: 'if it is not fear of the gods, then fear not *men*'.

929. See on *v.* 918.

932. They may submit (let themselves be conquered) with grace.

933. **ἦ...τίεις** *you plainly, no less than I, think the point worth contest.* She has spoken as if it were beneath his dignity to contest such a trifle. He retorts that the matter does not seem indifferent to her. **νίκην τήνδε** 'having the best in this matter'. **δήριος τίεις**: the genitive is that of price. For the archaic use of τίειν, 'to value at, rate at', see Hom. *Il.* 23. 703, 705.—Or we may join δήριος with νίκην, *do you yourself find a victory so won to your taste?* Here νίκην τήνδε means τὸ νικᾶσθαι (see preceding verse). But δήριος seems then superfluous.

934. *Yield: I constrain you; let it be with consent.* In **μέν τοι**, each particle has its separate force. For **μέν**, 'force *at all events*', cf. *v.* 915. The antithesis implied in **μέν**, but not formally completed, is between κράτος and ἑκών, *force* and *consent.* See also *Theb.* 736 γείνατο μὲν μόρον αὑτῷ *he begat a son only to be his death*, and note there.—**τοι** 'you know', an appeal to common sense, must generally be omitted in English for want of a compendious equivalent.—κρατεῖς

Ag. Never was last word spoken on better reflexion than this.

Cl. What had Priam done, thinkest thou, if he had achieved the same?

Ag. He had made him a fine fair path, I am very sure.

Cl. Then let not blame of men make thee ashamed.

Ag. But the voice of the multitude is a mighty thing.

Cl. Aye, but who moves no jealousy wins no envy.

Ag. To love contention is not a woman's part.

Cl. Nay, but the great may e'en yield a point with grace.

Ag. Thou plainly, no less than I, thinkest the point worth fight.

Cl. Yield: I constrain thee; let it be with consent.

Ag. Then, if this be thy will, quick, let one loose my shoes, these trodden slaves to the serving foot.—Even with these bare soles, as I walk the sacred purple, I hope no distant eye may give me an evil glance. It is shame enough to stain with the stain of human feet textures of price, purchased for silver.

μέντοι παρεὶς Weil and, omitting γ', Wecklein; 'you win however, if you yield willingly'; cf. *v.* 932.—With these words she lays hands upon the king, and compels him to descend.

936. **λύοι** for the usual *λυέτω*. See on *v.* 557.—**τάχος** adverbial, *with speed*.—The unusual pause after the second foot adds abruptness to the abrupt command. The king is impatient to have done.—**πρόδουλον**, *servant to a servant* (*vicarius*), meaner even than the foot (Schütz).—Here his shoes are taken off.

937. **καὶ τοῖσδε** *even with these if I tread* etc., *i.e τοῖς ποσίν*, with his bare feet, see *v.* 939. The demonstrative pronoun is explained by look and gesture. Even thus he fears to provoke 'the evil eye' by his act.—*τοῖσδε* may be taken with *ἁλουργέσιν*, but it is then superfluous, whereas by position it should be emphatic.—**θεῶν** belongs to *ἁλουργέσιν* (*sacred tapestries* proper only for divine service).—**ἁλουργέσιν**. The substantival use of *ἁλουργής* is irregular. Probably we should read therefore **ἁλουργίσιν**.

938. **μή βάλοι** *I hope no* distant *eye may give me an evil glance.* **πρόσωθεν** marks the point. See Appendix R. To supply *θεῶν* is not necessary. According to the superstition, the eye of human jealousy is as dangerous as the divine. See on *v.* 942.

939. **σωματοφθορεῖν ποσὶν φθείροντα** *to stain with the stain of human feet.* For *φθείρειν spoil* see *Cho.* 1011 *φόνου κηκὶς...πολλὰς βαφὰς φθείρουσα τοῦ ποικίλματος.*—**σωματοφθορεῖν** should not be rejected. For *σωματοφθόρος* 'staining (or stained) *with* the body' cf. *χειρομάχος*, *δακτυλοδεικτός* etc. Garments stained by wearing would be *σωματόφθορα*, the person wearing them *σωματοφθόρος εἱμάτων*, and his act *σωματοφθορεῖν εἵματα*. The word therefore distinguishes the bare feet ('feet of the body') from the shod.—For corrections (*εἱματοφθορεῖν*, *στρωματοφθορεῖν*, *δωματοφθορεῖν*) see Wecklein's Appendix.

940. **πλοῦτον ἀργυρωνήτους θ' ὑφάς** 'what is wealth, textures bought for silver'. **πλοῦτον**: in a restricted sense, as we speak of *the precious* metals. **ἀρ-**

τούτων μὲν οὕτω· τὴν ξένην δὲ πρευμενῶς
τήνδ' ἐσκόμιζε. τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλθακῶς
θεὸς πρόσωθεν εὐμενῶς προσδέρκεται·
ἑκὼν γὰρ οὐδεὶς δουλίῳ χρῆται ζυγῷ,
αὕτη δὲ πολλῶν χρημάτων ἐξαίρετον
ἄνθος στρατοῦ δώρημ' ἐμοὶ ξυνέσπετο.
ἐπεὶ δ' ἀκούειν σοῦ κατέστραμμαι τάδε,
εἶμ' ἐς δόμων μέλαθρα πορφύρας πατῶν.
ΚΛ. ἔστιν θάλασσα, τίς δέ νιν κατασβέσει;
τρέφουσα πολλῆς πορφύρας ἰσάργυρον
κηκῖδα παγκαίνιστον, εἱμάτων βαφάς.
οἶκος δ' ὑπάρχει τῶνδε σὺν θεοῖς, ἄναξ,
ἔχειν· πένεσθαι δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται δόμος.
πολλῶν πατησμὸν δ' εἱμάτων ἂν ηὐξάμην,
δόμοισι προυνεχθέντος ἐν χρηστηρίοις
ψυχῆς κόμιστρα τῆσδε μηχανωμένῃ.
ῥίζης γὰρ οὔσης φυλλὰς ἵκετ' ἐς δόμους,
σκιὰν ὑπερτείνασα σειρίου κυνός.
καὶ σοῦ μολόντος δωματῖτιν ἑστίαν,
θάλπος μὲν ἐν χειμῶνι σημαίνεις μολών·
ὅταν δὲ τεύχῃ Ζεὺς ἀπ' ὄμφακος πικρᾶς
οἶνον, τότ' ἤδη ψῦχος ἐν δόμοις πέλει

945. αὐτή. 948. δόμους (ων).
950. εἰς ἄργυρον. 954. δειμάτων. 956. μηχανωμένης.
961. τἄπ'.

γυρωνήτους: the ordinary dress, tapestry etc. of a Greek household were not bought, but made there.—**τε** is not necessary, but is often used where simple apposition would be admissible.

941. **τούτων μὲν οὕτω**: literally 'of this thus', a formula impatiently dismissing the subject. There is an ellipse of something (*e.g.* ἀπαλλαχθῶμεν), but of what, a native Greek might have been unable to say. Nothing parallel seems to occur elsewhere, for such a genitive as τοῦ κασιγνήτου τί φῄς, ἥξοντος ἢ μέλλοντος; (Soph. *El.* 317) may, as Wecklein says, be distinguished. τοὐμὸν Emperius, Wecklein.—**τὴν ξένην δὲ**: see Appendix R.

942. **τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλθακῶς**: see on *v.* 10. Whatever may be the effect on other 'distant eyes' (see *v.* 938), *divine* eyes at least will be propitiated by his humanity.

945. **αὕτη** Auratus.—"She therefore, as a delicate princess, will feel slavery

Of this enough. But here is one, whom thou must receive into the house with kindness. A gentle master wins from the distant eye of God an approving glance; for none takes willingly to the yoke of a slave, and this damsel is the choice flower of a rich treasure, bestowed by the soldiers upon me, with whom she goes.

And now, since I am reduced to obey thee herein, I will proceed to the palace along your purple path.

Cl. There is a sea (and who shall drain it dry?) which hath in it purple enough, precious as silver, oozing fresh and fresh, to dye vestures withal. And we have, O King, I trust, a chamber of such from which to take thereof, our house being unacquainted with poverty. Vestures plenty would I have devoted to the trampling, had it been proposed to me in some temple of divination, when I was devising means to bring this dear life back. It is the root of the house, whereby the leaves arrive that make a shade overhead against the dog-star. Yes, now, at thy coming to the familiar hearth, thy winter-coming betokens warmth, and when Zeus from the grape's sourness is making wine, then it is

---

the most keenly." So rightly Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XVII. 245.

949—953. 'There is purple enough in the sea, *and enough within*'. As the king proceeds along the path of crimson *ποικίλματα*, it is to the eye of the queen, who foresees the *εἱμάτων βαφὰς* that are to follow (*v.* 1382), as though already he walked in blood. There is also in the mere sound and imagery of the opening verse the feeling of her hatred, deep, cruel, and inexhaustible. But no commentary can exhaust the significance of this marvellous scene, which for spectacular writing, if the phrase may be used, has probably never been rivalled.—**θάλασσα**: see Appendix O.

950. **ἰσάργυρον** (Salmasius) *worth its weight in silver*: *ἰσοστάσιος γὰρ ἦν ἡ πορφύρα πρὸς ἄργυρον ἐξεταζομένη* (Theopompus ap. Athenaeum XII. 526 C, cited by Hermann).—**κηκῖδα παγκαίνιστον** *purple ooze ever fresh and fresh.* **κηκίς**, because the dye is the juice or *ooze* of a shell-fish. But it is the underlying thought, not the surface-meaning, which determines the expression.

952. *There is a store, I trust, from which to take thereof.* **τῶνδε** (*i.e. εἱμάτων*) depends on *ἔχειν* as partitive.—**σὺν θεοῖς**: see *v.* 904.—There is difficulty in **οἶκος**. But perhaps *οἶκος* may stand in the sense of 'household goods', 'store'.—**οἴκοι** Headlam, *οἴκοις* Porson.

954. **δ' εἱμάτων** Canter.

955. **προυνεχθέντος** *τοῦ εὔξασθαι*.—**δόμοισι...ἐν χρηστηρίοις** together.

956. **μηχανωμένῃ** Abresch, Hermann.

957. **ἵκετο**, gnomic aorist, *comes*. The comparison and the thing compared mix together, 'thy life is the root of the house, and thy safe coming as the putting forth of the shading leaves'.

957—963. The artificial manner recalls *vv.* 887 foll.

958. **σκιὰν...κυνός** *shade against*: see *ὕπνου ἄκος v.* 17.

960. **ἐν χειμῶνι.** See Introduction.

ἀνδρὸς τελείου δῶμ᾽ ἐπιστρωφωμένου.—
Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει,
μέλοι δέ τοι σοὶ τῶνπερ ἂν μέλλῃς τελεῖν.

ΧΟ. τίπτε μοι τόδ᾽ ἐμπέδως στρ. α΄.
δεῖγμα προστατήριον
καρδίας τετρασκόπου ποτᾶται,
μαντιπολεῖ δ᾽ ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος ἀοιδά;
οὐδ᾽ ἀποπτύσας δίκαν
δυσκρίτων ὀνειράτων
θάρσος εὐπειθὲς ἵζει,
φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον; χρόνος δ᾽ ἐπὶ
πρυμνησίων ξυνεμβόλοις
ψαμμί᾽ ἀκτᾶς παρή-
μησεν, εὖθ᾽ ὑπ᾽ Ἴλιον
ὦρτο ναυβάτας στρατός.
πεύθομαι δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ὀμμάτων ἀντ. α΄.
νόστον, αὐτόμαρτυς ὤν.

972. εὐπιθὲς. 973. ἐπεὶ. 975—76. ψαμμίας ἀκάτα παρήβησεν.

---

963. **τελείου** a grim word. As applied to the husband or master of the house, it means *governing*, 'bearing τέλος' *i.e.* authority or office (see on *Theb.* 152). But it is also a ritual term, applied to the *perfect* victim, fit for the sacrifice (cf. ἀνδροσφαγεῖον *v.* 1077 and note the ritual term τελεῖν, to accomplish a *rite*, in *v.* 964).

964. Agamemnon has passed within; Clytaemnestra turns at the door.—**τέλειε** 'supreme' and over all, as the man over the house (cf. the title Ἥρα τελεία given to the goddess of matronhood). Clytaemnestra conceives herself, as avenger of Iphigenia, to have a claim upon the god of family-life, if it is his pleasure to interfere at all.—**τέλει, μέλοι δὲ** *accomplish my prayers, and then thy providence may accomplish even what thou mayst intend*: *i.e.* 'give me vengeance, be the sequel what it may'. **μέλοι.** This use of the optative, to signify acquiescence, belongs to the same archaic syntax as the imperative optative (936). See Hom. *Il.* 21. 359 λῆγ᾽ ἔριδος, Τρῶας δὲ καὶ αὐτίκα δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς ἄστεος ἐξελάσειε, *cease strife, and I consent that* etc. (see Monro, *Homeric Grammar* § 299 for more illustrations).—For **μέλειν** of *moral providence* see *v.* 381 οὐκ ἔφα τις θεοὺς βροτῶν ἀξιοῦσθαι μέλειν ὅσοις ἀθίκτων χάρις πατοῖτο.—*V.* 965 may be taken as merely a repetition of τέλει, but this does not satisfy the generality of τῶνπερ ἂν μέλλῃς.—**τῶνπερ** (for τῶν τάπερ) is an example, said to be unique, of the Attic 'attraction' occurring in a relative of this archaic form. It could be removed by reading either μέλῃς or μέλῃ πέρι (Maehly).

965. Clytaemnestra enters the house,

to the home like a sudden coolness to be visited by the crowned lord thereof. [*Exit* AGAMEMNON.

Zeus, Zeus, who crownest all, crown but my prayers, and let thy providence do even what thou wilt.

[*Exit* CLYTAEMNESTRA; *the crowd disperses.*

The Elders. Why is it that so constantly my auguring soul shows at the door this fluttering sign, and the prophet-chant offers itself without bidding or fee? Canst thou not spit it away, like an unexplainable dream, and reach such willing trust as the mind is glad to rest upon? Yet time hath heaped the sands of the shore upon the anchor-stones (?), since the naval host set forth to Troy: and they are returned, mine own eyes tell me

---

leaving Cassandra seated in her chariot. As to the scene generally at this point see the Introduction.

967. **δεῖγμα** *sign*, *i.e.* 'advertisement' or 'warning' of something that is to come. For a not dissimilar use, see Eur. *El.* 1174 (Orestes and Electra, after slaying Clytaemnestra, come from the house with blood upon their feet) *τροπαῖα δείγματ' ἀθλίων προσφθεγμάτων* 'a victorious advertisement of the unhappy salutation (they will pronounce)'.—**δεῖμα** *Cod. Farn.*; see Appendix S.

970. **οὐδ' ἀποπτύσας...θρόνον;** *i.e.* 'why not dismiss at any rate for the time forebodings too obscure to be of any use?' He expostulates with himself.—**οὐδὲ**: literally 'wilt thou *not even*...?' or '*not so much as*...?'—**ἀποπτύσας...ἵζει**: for the relation of the participle and verb see *vv.* 606, 611, 1031, 1052 etc. The principal notion is in *ἀποπτύσας*, *quasi οὐκ ἀποπτύσεις, ὥστε ἱκέσθαι;*—**ἀποπτύσας** literally, the act being a magic prevention. If a dream can be interpreted, well; if not, you 'spit it away', and think no more about it. The object of *ἀποπτύσας* (*it*, the foreboding) is supplied from the previous sentence.—**εὐπειθὲς** (Jacob) 'easy-believing', see on *v.* 286, *i.e.* a *voluntary* trust.—**φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον**: in apposition to *θάρσος*, literally 'a welcome seat to the mind'.—If this sentence is taken as one with the preceding, there is no subject for *ἀποπτύσας...ἵζει*. Hence *ἀποπτύσαν ... ἵζει* (Scaliger, cf. *v.* 776) 'while confidence does not spit it away...and sit on the seat of my mind'. But the metaphors clash.

973—979. *I.e.* 'it is so long since the sacrifice at Aulis, and the prophecies thereupon (*v.* 160) are so far refuted by the king's safe return, that we might well be re-assured'.—The text is given merely as possible. **ἐπὶ** and *ἀκάτας Cod. Farn.*: **ἀκτᾶς** Wellauer. *ψαμμιακτας* is a combination of letters likely to produce error from confusion of *ψαμμία* (from *ψαμμίον*) with the adjective *ψάμμιος*. **παρήμησεν**: cf. *v.* 1420 *βιασμάτων Codex Venetus* for *μιασμάτων*. For **παρ-αμάω** *to heap as a cover* see *ἀμάω*, and compare *παραμπίσχω*, *παρακαλύπτω* etc.—**πρυμνησίων ξυνεμβόλοις**: a *ξυνέμβολον* is by etymology 'what is thrown in with' something, here with the cables (*πρυμνήσια*). It seems to describe the large stones which the Greeks used as anchors. The lapse of time since the fleet was moored (*v.* 205) at Aulis is marked by the fact that 'the mooring-stones have disappeared in the sand'.—**εὖτε** *since* in the temporal sense, as Sophocles occasionally (*O. C.* 84) uses it for *since* in the causal sense. Cf. the uses of *ἐπεί*.—*χρόνος παρήβησεν* 'time has passed his youth' does not seem to bear any natural sense. The tense at any rate should be perfect (*παρήβηκεν* Headlam).

τὸν δ', ἄνευ λύρας ὅπως, ὑμνῳδεῖ
θρῆνον Ἐρινύος αὐτοδίδακτος ἔσωθεν
θυμός, οὐ τὸ πᾶν ἔχων
ἐλπίδος φίλον θράσος.
σπλάγχνα δ' οὔτοι ματάζει,
πρὸς ἐνδίκοις φρεσὶν τελεσφόροις
δίναις κυκλούμενον κέαρ.
εὔχομαι δ' ἐξ ἐμᾶς
ἐλπίδος ψύδη πεσεῖν
ἐς τὸ μὴ τελεσφόρον.
μάλα γάρ τοι τᾶς πολλᾶς ὑγιείας — στρ. β'.
ἀκόρεστον τέρμα· νόσος γὰρ
γείτων ὁμότοιχος ἐρείδει.
καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν
ἀνδρὸς ἔπαισεν ἄφαντον ἕρμα.
καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων
κτησίων, ὄκνος βαλὼν
σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου,
οὐκ ἔδυ πρόπας δόμος
πλμονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν,

981. ἐριννὺς. 999. πημονὰς.

---

980. **τὸν**, demonstrative, *that strain* (ὕμνον), θρῆνον Ἐρινύος a further description as in Homer (Monro, *Hom. Gr.* §§ 258, 259).—**ἄνευ λύρας ὅπως** 'sings *without the lyre as it were*' *i.e.* unbidden, uninvited, ἀκέλευστος (*v.* 969), an expression apparently arising from the Greek habit of passing the lyre in company. To receive the lyre was to be asked to sing; ἄνευ λύρας ᾄδειν therefore 'to sing unasked'. *Sad* (see ἄλυρος, ἀφόρμικτος) is also part of the meaning.—**Ἐρινύος** Porson.—ὅμως Auratus.

982. **οὐ τὸ πᾶν** *not to the full.* The misgiving recurs in spite of the encouraging circumstances.

984. **σπλάγχνα.** The metaphor passes from the μάντις to the *inward parts* of the victim from which he draws his conclusions.

985. *The throb that with meaning recurrence the heart repeats to the unmistaken breast,* literally 'the coming round of the heart with portentous revolution against the truth-telling breast'.

987. *But I pray my false expectation may lose itself in void,* literally 'that out of my expectation may come falsehood falling into non-accomplishment'.—**ψύδη** is part of the predicate, like a 'proleptic' epithet. (The form may be right: ψύδος may have existed as well as ψύθος. The stem ψυδ- is warranted by ψευδής.)

990—991. Doubtful in reading; compare the antistrophe (*vv.* 1004—1005). The general meaning is clear in both

so. But yet, as without the lyre, my bosom repeats that dirge of Doom, unlearned and self-inspired, unable to grasp in full the welcome assurance of hope. It cannot be for naught, the throb that with meaning recurrence the heart repeats to the unmistaken breast. But I pray my false expectation may lose itself in void.

Too true it is, that the health which abounds encroaches; for sickness is its neighbour right up to the wall: and human fortune, running straight, will strike on a hidden reef. And as to the saving of goods, fear, discharging the measured scale, may keep the whole house from sinking under an over-freight

---

places. On the metre see Appendix II.—'True it is that *the health, which abounds, encroaches*; for sickness is its neighbour right up to the wall', *i.e.* 'high condition passes easily into bad condition', and generally 'great prosperity is dangerous'.—**τᾶς πολλᾶς ὑγιείας**: health lies in moderation, and is essentially a *μέσον* not a πολύ.—**ἀκόρεστον τέρμα** *its boundary is unsatisfied* or *rapacious*, the quality of the encroaching neighbour being metaphorically given to the boundary (*τέρμα*) which he pushes forward into his neighbour's land. The meaning is that, becoming πολλή, *ὑγίεια* necessarily *enlarges into νόσος*, there being no interval between them.—**ἐρείδει** *presses close to*.

993—994. **ἀνδρὸς**: *i.e. βροτοῦ* as occasionally in poetry. See *Theb.* 425, where *ἀνδράσιν* is opposed to *θεούς*, and note there. There is no sign here of anything lost. See on the antistrophe, *v.* 1008.

995—1009. A difficult passage. The general connexion is this. All prosperity is dangerous (990—994); and, while some kinds of loss may be averted by a timely and willing sacrifice of gain (995—1000), which sacrifice itself the bounty of heaven can make good (1001—1003), the *life* once lost is never restored (1004—1006), no, not the life of the most virtuous (1007—1009). Thus *vv.* 1001—1003 are not a fresh illustration, but a parenthetic remark upon the foregoing illustration. See Housman, *Journal of Philology*, XVI. p. 271.

995. **τὸ μὲν** answers to **τὸ δὲ** in *v.* 1004, *on the one hand...on the other.*

995—1000. A ship may be saved if not overloaded.—**τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων κτησίων**: literally 'so far as concerns the preservation of wealth': **πρό** *on behalf of*. (We can scarcely separate *πρό* from *χρημάτων*, or make *χρ. κτ.* mean 'the main cargo' as opposed to part of it.)—**ὄκνος βαλὼν** (*χρήματα*) *if apprehension discharges it*: for the 'pendent' nominative participle cf. *Supp.* 455 *καὶ γλῶσσα τοξεύσασα μὴ τὰ καίρια, γένοιτο μύθου μῦθος ἂν θελκτήριος*: it is really 'in apposition to' the main sentence, like the much commoner accusative (*v.* 236); the 'casting-off' is 'the not-sinking of the house'.—**σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου**: *from the duly-weighted sling*, *i.e.* from the loading-scale: see Appendix T.—**δόμος** is not part of the metaphor of the ship, but is the thing metaphorically compared to a ship, the *house* (cf. *v.* 388), which by liberality desires to escape the penalty of too much. **πημονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν** *over-fraught with riches* (Housman). For *πημονή*, from *πάομαι*, *to possess*, a synonym of *πᾶμα*, compare the parallel forms *πημονή—πῆμα*, *χαρμονή—χάρμα*, *πλησμονή—πλῆσμα*: so also *πᾶσις· κτῆσις*

οὐδ' ἐπόντισε σκάφος.
πολλά τοι δόσις ἐκ Διὸς ἀμφιλαφής τε, καὶ
ἐξ ἀλόκων ἐπετειᾶν
νῆστιν ὤλεσεν νόσον.
τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γᾶν πεσόνθ' † ἅπαξ θανάσιμον — ἀντ. β΄.
πρόπαρ ἀνδρὸς μέλαν αἷμα τίς ἂν
πάλιν ἀγκαλέσαιτ' ἐπαείδων;
οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθοδαῆ
τῶν φθιμένων ἂν ἐπ' ἀβλαβείᾳ.
εἰ δὲ μὴ τεταγμένα
μοῖρα μοῖραν ἐκ θεῶν
εἶργε μὴ πλέον φέρειν,
προφθάσασα καρδία
γλῶσσαν ἂν τάδ' ἐξέχει.
νῦν δ' ὑπὸ σκότῳ βρέμει
θυμαλγής τε καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπελπομένα ποτὲ
καίριον ἐκτολυπεύσειν
ζωπυρουμένας φρενός.

ΚΛ. εἴσω κομίζου καὶ σύ, Κασάνδραν λέγω,

1007—9. *φθιμένων ἀνάγειν* | *Ζεὺς αὔτ' ἔπαυσ' ἐπ' αὐλαβείᾳ.*
1015. *βλέπει* corr. to *βρέμει.*

Hesychius, *πάτορες· κτήτορες* Photius. See *Journal of Philology l.c.*: *πημονᾶς* *mischief*, *damage*, does not fit the sense.

1001—1003. *Rich, we know, and abundant is the gift of Zeus, and rids the plague of hunger out of the annual field*, *i.e.* the produce of each year supplies the year's food. As Heaven gives man year by year *in plenty* what is needful for him, the eagerness for more than plenty is inexcusable. Agriculture, as usual, is the type of natural prosperity, and commerce (the *impiae rates* of Horace *Od.* I. 3) that of avarice and excess.—**ὤλεσεν νόσον**, as if hunger were some weed or other mischievous thing in the soil (cf. *ἄφερτος αἰανὴς νόσος Eum.* 482, 943) which Zeus, by his bounty, destroys.—*ἤλασεν* Schütz.

1004. **τὸ δὲ**: see on *v.* 995.—*πεσὸν* Auratus, probably; but see Appendix II.

1005. **μέλαν**: see on *Theb.* 43.

1007. **οὐδὲ...ἀβλαβείᾳ** *nay, to revive the most straitly virtuous were a sin*: literally 'not even the straitly virtuous of the dead may one recall from the dead with innocency'.—**ἂν**, supply *ἀνακαλέσαιτό τις*, the elliptical **ἂν** marking, as usual, that the verb of the previous sentence, as well as the subject, is continued.—**τὸν ὀρθοδαῆ** literally 'the rightly schooled', cf. the Homeric *δαΐφρων virtuous.* The allusion is to the

of riches, as a boat from going down. (Rich we know and abundant is the gift of Zeus, and rids the plague of hunger out of the annual field.) But as for a man's red blood, once shed from his dying body upon the ground, who with incantation may call it back? Nay, not the straitest in virtue may be called from the dead without sin!

And were it not that one god's purpose doth check and limit another's decree, my heart outrunning my tongue would have poured these bodings forth: but now she mutters in darkness, vexed and hopeless ever to wind off her task in time, and stirring the fire within me.

[*Enter* CLYTAEMNESTRA.]

Clytaemnestra. Come in with thee, thou also, Cassandra,

---

standing example of Hippolytus (Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 98, Eur. *Alc.* 123, Horace, *Od.* 4. 7. 25, Virg. *Aen.* 7. 765): for restoring him to life Asklepios was slain by Zeus, and according to one form of the story Hippolytus also perished a second time (see Horace). Hippolytus is the typical *ascetic*, trained in the Orphic discipline above the common level of humanity (see Eur. *Hipp.* 11, 952, and *passim*). Hence ὀρθοδαῆ here: the word itself is probably Orphic; see the references to the late *Orphica* in L. and Sc. *s.vv.* ὀρθοδότειρα, δαητός.—**τῶν φθιμένων**: the genitive is constructed (as *partitive*) with τὸν ὀρθοδαῆ and is also supplied (as *ablative*) with the verb.—**ἀβλαβείᾳ** (*Cod. Farn.*) is probably right. Either this passage is interpolated or the strophe deficient. The error is probably here, since the required excision leaves a text liable to be misunderstood and filled up. Moreover the strophe is sense as it stands, and this is not. The insertion may come from a note or notes, ἀνάγοι and Ζεὺς αὐτὸ ἔπαυσε *i.e.* 'supply ἀνάγοι', 'Zeus put an end to it', or the like.

1010—1014. 'So strong is my sense of an evil destiny at work, that I must perforce have spoken, but for the consoling reflexion, that it may be counteracted by a good destiny', for there are many divine powers, whose purposes sometimes clash, and in the case of Agamemnon there is evidence both for the evil destiny and for the good. (Professor Goodwin, cited and followed by Mr Sidgwick.)—**τεταγμένα...ἐκ θεῶν** *decreed by gods* belongs both to μοῖρα and (supplied again in the accusative) to μοῖραν.—**μὴ πλέον φέρειν**: with **εἶργε** literally *prevent from winning more, encroaching further*: cf. πλεονέκτης *taking more than your own.*

1015—1017. **νῦν δέ** '*as it is* I ponder the matter sadly and without reaching any conclusion'. The figure, homely but vivid, is that of a woman with her wool, working in the winter against time, as we say, with no better light than she gets by stirring her fire. Virgil may perhaps have taken a touch from here for a well-known picture in the *Aeneid* (8. 410), 'cum femina primum, | cui tolerare colo vitam tenuique Minerva | impositum, *cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignes* | noctem addens operi'.

1019. Clytaemnestra, coming from the house, finds Cassandra still seated in the chariot and summons her imperiously to join, as a member of the household, the sacrifice which is to be performed for the king's return.

ἐπεί σ' ἔθηκε Ζεὺς ἀμηνίτως δόμοις
κοινωνὸν εἶναι χερνίβων, πολλῶν μετὰ
δούλων σταθεῖσαν κτησίου βωμοῦ πέλας.
ἔκβαιν' ἀπήνης τῆσδε, μηδ' ὑπερφρόνει.
καὶ παῖδα γάρ τοι φασὶν Ἀλκμήνης ποτὲ
πραθέντα τλῆναι δουλίας μάζης βίᾳ.
εἰ δ' οὖν ἀνάγκη τῆσδ' ἐπιρρέποι τύχης,
ἀρχαιοπλούτων δεσποτῶν πολλὴ χάρις·
οἳ δ' οὔποτ' ἐλπίσαντες ἤμησαν καλῶς,
ὠμοί τε δούλοις πάντα καὶ παράσταθμοι.
ἔχεις παρ' ἡμῶν οἷάπερ νομίζεται.
ΧΟ. σοί τοι λέγουσα παύεται σαφῆ λόγον.
ἐντὸς δ' ἂν οὖσα μορσίμων ἀγρευμάτων
πείθοι' ἄν, εἰ πείθοι'· ἀπειθοίης δ' ἴσως.
ΚΛ. ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἐστὶ μὴ χελιδόνος δίκην
ἀγνῶτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη,
ἔσω φρενῶν λέγουσα πείθω νιν λόγῳ.
ΧΟ. ἕπου· τὰ λῷστα τῶν παρεστώτων λέγει.
πιθοῦ λιποῦσα τόνδ' ἁμαξήρη θρόνον.
ΚΛ. οὔτοι θυραίαν τήνδ' ἐμοὶ σχολὴ πάρα

1025. *δουλείας. βία.* 1029. *παραστάθμων.* 1038. *πείθου.*

1020. **ἀμηνίτως** *not ungraciously*, because in a humane house, where the slaves are members of the family, not merely chattels.

1022. **κτησίου βωμοῦ**: the altar of Zeus Ktesios, guardian of the property and therefore of the slaves.

1025. **πραθέντα τλῆναι** literally 'being sold (as a slave) endured', *i.e. bore up under the conditions of slavery*, distinguishable from *ἔτλη πραθῆναι* 'bore to be sold'; see *Theb.* 739 *σπείρας ἔτλα* and note there.—**δουλίας μάζης βίᾳ** *in spite of the slaves' porridge.* Heracles, as a great feeder, would feel the more this sort of privation. Hence the saying, which Clytaemnestra coarsely applies to the case of the enslaved princess. The fare is personified as a kind of adversary.

1026. **οὖν** implies that other hypotheses are dismissed and this hypothesis, 'that one is to be a slave', is taken instead (see on *v.* 681). In English 'if that fate *must* fall to one'. A scholium rightly explains the meaning by filling up the ellipse: *καλὸν μέν, φησί, μὴ πειραθῆναι δουλείας, εἰ δὲ πειρῷτό τις, κάλλιον ἀρχαιοπλούτοις δουλεύειν.* Cf. *Cho.* 563 foll. *καὶ δὴ οὔτις ἂν...δέξαιτο· εἰ δ' οὖν ἀμείψω* 'if I *do* enter' etc., Soph. *O. T.* 851 *εἰ δ' οὖν τι κἀκτρέποιτο* 'even if he *should* diverge somewhat' etc., and passages collected in Paley's note.—**ἐπιρρέποι**: the optative puts the case as an imaginary general supposition.

1028. **ἤμησαν καλῶς** literally 'have made a good heap', *i.e.* become suddenly rich; probably a phrase from mining.

thou: since Zeus of his mercy hath set thee in a house, where thou mayst share the holy water in thy place with the crowd of slaves at the altar of stead and store. Descend from the car, and be not proud. They say that Alcmena's son himself was sold, and still bore up in spite of the slave's low fare. If it so fall that one needs must take that state, masters not new to wealth are a thing to be thankful for. They to whom a rich pile hath come by surprise are to their slaves cruel always and over-strict. From us thou art receiving what custom bids.

An Elder. 'Tis to thee she speaks, and plainly. She waits for thee. And maybe, since thou art in the toils of fate, thou shouldst obey, if it may be,—though maybe thou wilt not.

Cl. Nay, if her foreign tongue is anything less uncouth than a swallow's twitter, my reason urged is spoken within her understanding.

Eld. Go with her. She urges what, as things are, is best. Obey, arise, and leave the chariot.

Cl. I have no leisure, you may know, to be thus dallying

This sense of *ἀμάω* (*sweep together*) is more common in the compounds *ἐπαμάομαι, συναμάομαι*, etc., but occurs also in later literature for the simple verb (see L. and Sc. *s.v.*).—*ἐκ θερισμοῦ* (schol.) has the advantage of giving to *ἀμάω* an older sense. But a harvest is not a likely type of sudden and unexpected gain.

1029. **ὠμοί τε...καὶ παράσταθμοι** *cruël and over-exacting*; 'exceeders of the proper standard': cf. *παράνομος.*—*Cod. Farn.* *παρὰ στάθμην.*

1030. *Thou art receiving from us the treatment due by custom*, in being invited to share the family worship. See on *v.* 1020.

1031. **σοὶ...παύεται.** The participle is principal, *παύεται* adding only the notion that she waits for compliance.—**σαφῆ**: only too plain, as they think.

1032. **ἂν...πείθοι' ἄν.** The optative with *ἂν* is a gentle imperative, properly a suggestion of something which may be done. The courtesy of the speaker throws into relief the harshness of the queen, and is emphasized by the anticipatory *ἄν.*—*ἀλοῦσα* (C. G. Haupt).

1033. **εἰ πείθοιο**: a further qualification, *if thou wouldst* (obey); see *v.* 1393. **ἀπειθοίης δ'(ἂν) ἴσως**: *i.e.* though I can understand it if you do not. **ἂν** is carried on as in Soph. *O.T.* 937 *ἥδοιο μέν, πῶς δ' οὐκ ἄν; ἀσχάλλοις δ' ἴσως*: literally 'perhaps thou mayst disobey'.

1034. **μὴ χελιδόνος δίκην ἀγνῶτα** lit. 'not as a swallow's unintelligible'. The negative belongs to *χελιδόνος δίκην*, not to *φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη.* The queen holds an opinion, which still, though not professed, is often betrayed, that her own language is essentially rational, and that any human speech must bear so much analogy to it, as to make it intelligible, if *spoken simply and clearly.*—For the *swallow*, cf. Aristoph. *Frogs* 688, *Birds* 1681.

1036. *The persuasions I urge are spoken within her understanding.* Again the participle is principal, as in *v.* 1031.

1037. **τῶν παρεστώτων** 'of what the circumstances allow', *P. V.* 232, Aristoph. *Knights* 30 (Wecklein).

1039. **θυραίαν** is a substantive, like *τροπαία* (see *δυσσεβῆ τροπαίαν v.* 229)

τρίβειν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἑστίας μεσομφάλου
ἕστηκεν ἤδη μῆλα πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρός,
ὡς οὔποτ' ἐλπίσασι τήνδ' ἕξειν χάριν·
σὺ δ' εἴ τι δράσεις τῶνδε, μὴ σχολὴν τίθει.
εἰ δ' ἀξυνήμων οὖσα μὴ δέχει λόγον,
σὺ δ' ἀντὶ φωνῆς φράζε καρβάνῳ χερί.

ΧΟ. ἑρμηνέως ἔοικεν ἡ ξένη τοροῦ
δεῖσθαι· τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὡς νεαιρέτου.

ΚΛ. ἦ μαίνεταί γε καὶ κακῶν κλύει φρενῶν,
ἥτις λιποῦσα μὲν πόλιν νεαίρετον
ἥκει, χαλινὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται φέρειν,
πρὶν αἱματηρὸν ἐξαφρίζεσθαι μένος.
οὐ μὴν πλέω ῥίψασ' ἀτιμασθήσομαι.

ΧΟ. ἐγὼ δ', ἐποικτείρω γάρ, οὐ θυμώσομαι.
ἴθ', ὦ τάλαινα, τόνδ' ἐρημώσασ' ὄχον,
ἑκοῦσ' ἀνάγκῃ τῇδε καίνισον ζυγόν.

1048. ἥ. 1051—1158. Readings of M. 1052. *μὴ* (*μὴν* m).

---

and *εὐναία* (= *εὐνή*). An ellipse of *τριβήν* can scarcely be supposed, when the verb *τρίβειν*, from which it is to be supplied, follows, and at such a distance. But apparently the ellipse became stereotyped and thus formed a popular substantive *θυραία* *gadding, staying out of the house.* For a parallel see *Theb.* 692 *τροπαίᾳ χρονίᾳ ἴσως ἂν ἔλθοι θελεμωτέρῳ πνεύματι*, where *πνοῇ*, lost by fixed ellipse in *τροπαίᾳ*, reappears in *πνεύματι*, as here *τριβή* in *τρίβειν*.—*σχολὴν* Dobree.

1040. **τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἑστίας μεσομφάλου κτλ.** literally 'for as to the matters of the central hearth, the sheep are already placed', *i.e.* 'the state of our sacrifice within is that the sheep' etc.—For *τὰ ἑστίας μεσομφάλου*, grammatically in a loose apposition to the sentence *ἕστηκεν κτλ.*, cf. *v.* 995 *τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων* and *v.* 821 *τὰ δ' ἐς τὸ σὸν φρόνημα*. So Peile and others rightly; but **μὲν** nevertheless answers to **δέ** in *v.* 1043 (Hermann).—The alternative is to take *τὰ* as a demonstrative anticipating *μῆλα* (Monro, *Hom. Grammar* §§ 258, 259) and *ἑστίας* as a locative with *ἕστηκε*. But the locative uses of the genitive (see Monro, *Hom. Grammar* § 149) do not seem to justify this; *ἑστίας ἕστηκε* should mean 'stand on the altar side' or 'in the altar part' of something.—**μεσομφάλου** refers here to the position of the altar *in the centre* of the *αὐλή*, or court of the palace, within. But since the word occurs in the tragedians repeatedly as the title of the sanctuary at Delphi (*Theb.* 732 etc.; Eur. *Ion* 462 has the exact phrase *μεσόμφαλος ἑστία*), and this is the only place where it is applied to anything else, we should look for some intention. Cassandra (see the sequel) is wearing her robes and insignia as prophetess of Apollo, is dressed in fact as the Pythia. To this, apparently, Clytaemnestra mockingly refers: 'as for a *ἑστία μεσόμφαλος*, that is all ready; if

abroad. For the hearth, 'the central hearth', hath its victims already placed, for the sacrifice of the fire—since of the present joy there was no expectation! And thou, if thou wilt take part in this, must not delay. If for want of understanding thou takest not what I say, then with thy foreign hand converse instead of voice (?).

Eld. An interpreter, and a plain one, the strange lady doth indeed seem to want. She hath the air of a beast new-taken.

Cl. Aye, mad she is, and listens to her folly. She comes here from a new-taken town, and yet she has not the sense to bear the bridle, until she foam her humour away in blood! But I will waste words no more, to be so scorned! [*Exit.*

Eld. And I, for I pity her, will not be angry. Come now, unhappy, come down from where thou ridest, and take on thee willingly the new yoke of hard fate.

---

you, the prophetess, mean to take your part, you must come at once'.

1041. **πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρός**: perhaps *for the sacrifice of the fire, i.e.* for the feast which they were already holding in honour of the beacon (πῦρ as in *vv.* 481, 593). This, says the queen, they had commenced before, not expecting (naturally) to have 'the present joy' of seeing the king arrive close after his message. **τῆνδε** has an emphasis.—The received interpretation of πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρός, so far as any is received, has been 'to be slain for the fire', *i.e.* for burning on the altar. But there is a long list of corrections, πάρος *before* (Musgrave) the least unsatisfactory. As taken above, the words are certainly obscure, but may not this be intentional?

1042. **ὡς οὔποτ' ἐλπίσασι** *as it was never expected,* literally 'as for persons not having any expectation'. The absence of a defining pronoun gives the same force as the English passive.—Some take *v.* 1042 to mean 'as for an unexpected triumph'. But surely this could not account for the fact that the victims were *ready.*

1044. **εἰ** *since.* Clytaemnestra explains her command by gesture.

1045. Doubtful. Neither the apodotic **δέ** nor the emphatic **σὺ** is satisfactory; *Eum.* 888 is not parallel. And how should Cassandra answer without understanding? Wecklein refers σύ to the elder, who is to explain Clytaemnestra's words by signs. In that case we should suppose that the sentence is impatiently broken off at λόγον.—**φράζε** *signify your meaning.* See Herod. 4. 113 καὶ φωνῆσαι μὲν οὐκ εἶχε, οὐ γὰρ συνίεσαν ἀλλήλων, τῇ δὲ χειρὶ ἔφραζε (Wecklein).

ib. Cassandra takes no notice of the queen, but her bearing and gestures begin to express a great horror. The elders understand nothing: Clytaemnestra understands only too well. Perceiving her imprudence and danger, she quits the stage hastily as if in indignation at the captive's perversity.

1048. **κλύει** *listens to, obeys.*

1051. **αἱματηρὸν** predicate, *in blood.*

1055. *Take on thee without resistance the new yoke of this necessity.* **ἀνάγκῃ** a possessive dative. The ἀνάγκη is personified as imposing the yoke. For the antithesis **ἑκοῦσ' ἀνάγκῃ** (do willingly what must be done) see *v.* 934.—εἴκουσ' Robortello.

ΚΑΣΑΝΔΡΑ.

ὀτοτοτοτοῖ ποποῖ δᾶ. στρ. α′.
ὦπολλον ὦπολλον.
ΧΟ. τί ταῦτ᾽ ἀνωτότυξας ἀμφὶ Λοξίου ;
οὐ γὰρ τοιοῦτος ὥστε θρηνητοῦ τυχεῖν.
ΚΑ. ὀτοτοτοτοῖ ποποῖ δᾶ. ἀντ. α′.
ὦπολλον ὦπολλον.
ΧΟ. ἣ δ᾽ αὖτε δυσφημοῦσα τὸν θεὸν καλεῖ
οὐδὲν προσήκοντ᾽ ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν.
ΚΑ. Ἄπολλον Ἄπολλον στρ. β′.
ἀγυιᾶτ᾽, ἀπόλλων ἐμός·
ἀπώλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον.
ΧΟ. χρήσειν ἔοικεν ἀμφὶ τῶν αὑτῆς κακῶν.
μένει τὸ θεῖον δουλίᾳ παρ᾽ ἐν φρενί.
ΚΑ. Ἄπολλον Ἄπολλον ἀντ. β′.
ἀγυιᾶτ᾽, ἀπόλλων ἐμός.
ἆ ποῖ ποτ᾽ ἤγαγές με ; πρὸς ποίαν στέγην ;
ΧΟ. πρὸς τὴν Ἀτρειδῶν. εἰ σὺ μὴ τόδ᾽ ἐννοεῖς,
ἐγὼ λέγω σοι· καὶ τάδ᾽ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ψύθη.
ΚΑ. ἆ ἆ στρ. γ′.
μισόθεον μὲν οὖν, πολλὰ συνίστορα,
αὐτοφόνα κακὰ κάρτα· ναί,
ἀνδροσφαγεῖον, παιδιορραντήριον.
ΧΟ. ἔοικεν εὖρις ἡ ξένη κυνὸς δίκην

1076. καρτάναι. 1077. ἀνδρὸς σφάγιον καὶ πεδορραντήριον.

1056. Cassandra leaves the chariot and comes forward, away from the palace. The prophetic frenzy is upon her, and she sees both the past and the future of the bloody house.—**ποποῖ δᾶ.** The origin and original meaning of these exclamations is uncertain. *δᾶ* is commonly identified with a form for *γᾶ*.—*τοτοῖ* Dindorf: *πόποι* others.

1057. **Ἄπολλον.** The story is given below, *v.* 1201.

1062. **δὲ** *yet*, where prose would use ἀλλά.

1065. **ἀπόλλων ἐμός· ἀπώλεσας γὰρ,** bringing out the suggestion of the name. **οὐ μόλις** 'more than enough' to deserve the name.—**ἀγυιᾶτα,** voc. of *ἀγυιάτης* ; addressing (as a new-comer to the house?) the guardian Apollo before the door in the street (*ἀγυιά*). So Polynices leaving his father's house addresses his farewell specially to the **Φοῖβος Ἀγυιεύς** (Eur.

Cassandra. Ah!...O God!...Apollo, O Apollo!

Eld. What means this sad cry on the name of Loxias? It suits him not to meet a singer so melancholy.

Cass. Ah!...O God!...Apollo, O Apollo!

Eld. Once more the ill-omened cry, and upon that god, one all unfit for a scene of lamentation!

Cass. Apollo, God of the Gate, a very Apollo to me! Thou hast more than proved thy name, before and now again.

Eld. She will prophesy, methinks, upon her own miseries. The soul retains that gift, when all but that is slave.

Cass. Apollo, God of the Gate, a very Apollo to me! Ah, where, where hast thou led me? Oh, what house should this be?

Eld. The palace of Atreus sure it is. That, if thou conceivest it not, I tell to thee: and thou canst not say it is false.

Cass. Ah no, ah no, an abominable place, full of guilty secrets...yea, of unnatural murders...aye verily, a place of human sacrifice, sprinkled with blood of babes!

Eld. The strange woman doth indeed seem keen as a hound

Phoen. 631, see also Ar. *Vesp.* 869).

1066. **ἀπώλεσας** *thou hast been a destroyer.*

1067. **χρήσειν**: *i.e.* she is about to 'declaim' in the style of inspiration. The first effect of this is to diminish their sympathy; they are even disposed to sneer (*vv.* 1072—73). Their attitude towards *μαντική* is the common attitude, a dislike between fear and contempt.

1068. *The soul retains inspiration, when all is slave but that.* **δουλίᾳ παρ' ἓν** literally 'slave-like save one thing' or 'with one exception'; for the use of *παρά* see L. and Sc. *s. v.* The Greeks viewed the *δοῦλος* as something in nature different from the *ἐλεύθερος*, something between the complete man and the mere animal, and also held that, as Homer says, enslavement changed the nature, brutalizing and debasing it to the new condition. Of this the elders suppose themselves to be witnessing a signal illustration: Cassandra, they think, is scarcely rational; she can neither understand nor signify her thoughts. But a slave might be 'possessed' no less than the free. 'The spiritual faculty is the last to go'. But the sarcasm recoils, as is the intention, upon the speakers.—*δουλίᾳ περ ἐν* Schütz.

1071. **ἤγαγες**: as *ἀγ-υιάτης*.—**ποίαν**; (1) *to what a house* (this is meant), (2) *to what house* (hence the reply).

1072. 'If *thou* (the prophetess) perceivest not that, *I* can tell it thee; *and thou wilt not find it untrue*'.

1075. **πολλὰ συνίστορα** *full of guilty secrets*: **συνίστορα** acc. sing. (from *συνειδέναι τι ἑαυτῷ* to have a thing upon the conscience) takes the construction (*πολλά*) of a participle. Kühner, *Gr. Grammar* § 409, note 4 a.—**κακά**, in apposition to *πολλά*.

1076. See Appendix U.

1077. **ἀνδροσφαγεῖον** Dobree: **παιδιορραντήριον**: compare *παίδιον* (M) for *πεδίον v.* 309. The word is a compound like *ἀνδροσφαγεῖον*, made by the poet for the occasion: *a place where human beings are sacrificed, where babes are bled for the sprinkling,* both *σφάζειν* and *ῥαίνειν* being used as terms of ritual. The

εἶναι, ματεύει δ' ὧν ἀνευρήσει φόνον.
ΚΑ. μαρτυρίοισι γὰρ τοῖσδ' ἐπιπείθομαι· ἀντ. γ΄.
κλαιόμενα τὰ βρέφη σφαγὰς
ὀπτάς τε σάρκας πρὸς πατρὸς βεβρωμένας.
ΧΟ. ἦμεν κλέος σου μαντικὸν πεπυσμένοι,
ἦμεν· προφήτας δ' οὔτινας μαστεύομεν.
ΚΑ. ἰὼ ποποῖ, τί ποτε μήδεται; στρ. δ΄.
τί τόδε νέον ἄχος μέγα
μέγ' ἐν δόμοισι τοῖσδε μήδεται κακὸν
ἄφερτον φίλοισιν,
δυσίατον; ἀλκὰ δ'
ἑκὰς ἀποστατεῖ.
ΧΟ. τούτων ἄιδρίς εἰμι τῶν μαντευμάτων.
ἐκεῖνα δ' ἔγνων· πᾶσα γὰρ πόλις βοᾷ.
ΚΑ. ἰὼ τάλαινα, τόδε γὰρ τελεῖς; ἀντ. δ΄.
τὸν ὁμοδέμνιον πόσιν
λουτροῖσι φαιδρύνασα—πῶς φράσω τέλος;
τάχος γὰρ τόδ' ἔσται.
προτείνει δὲ χεῖρ' ἐκ
χερὸς ὀρεγομένα.
ΧΟ. οὔπω ξυνῆκα· νῦν γὰρ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων
ἐπαργέμοισι θεσφάτοις ἀμηχανῶ.
ΚΑ. ἒ ἒ παπαῖ παπαῖ, στρ. ε΄.
τί τόδε φαίνεται;
ἦ δίκτυόν τι Ἅιδου.
ἀλλ' ἄρκυς ἡ ξύνευνος, ἡ ξυναιτία.

1079. μαντεύει. ἂν εὑρήσῃ. 1080. μαρτυρίοισ. τοῖσδε πεπείθομαι.
1081. τάδε. 1084. ἦμεν· ἤμην. 1086. ἄχθος (ἄχος m).
1097. χεὶρ corr. to χεῖρ'. 1098. χειρὸς. 1103. τί γ'.

children of Thyestes (*v.* 1081) were slain as Agamemnon is about to be slain, under the pretext of a sacrificial feast (see *v.* 1592).—πεδορραντήριον 'a place where *the floor* is sprinkled' is generally allowed to be faulty: the MS. reading may have come from an attempt to restore the metre, destroyed by the misspelling πεδιορραντήριον.

1079. **εἶναι**: with emphasis as in 1047.

upon a scent. She is on a track of murder where she will find.

Cass. Yes, there is the evidence that I trust upon! See yonder babes, weeping their sacrifice, their flesh roasted and eaten by their sire!

Eld. We had heard of thy fame as prophetess, had heard of it: we seek none to speak for thee.

Cass. O God!...What is this, what purpose of strange woe, horrible, horrible, that she purposeth here within? Woe to her nearest, woe beyond remedy, and no help nigh!

Eld. This prophesying is beyond my knowledge. The other I knew, for all the town is loud with it.

Cass. O cruel! Wilt thou do it? The partner of thy bed, wilt thou cleanse him with lustration, and then—oh, how can I say it? Aye, soon it will be done. She is reaching forth, she is stretching hand after hand!

Eld. I understand not yet. Then hints, now oracles blind perplex me still.

Cass. Ah!......

What appeareth now? Surely a net of Death! Nay, rather the snare is she, who shared the bed, who shares the crime.

—**ματεύει**: literally 'she is seeking the blood of those of whom she will find the blood'. The elders, at first not impressed, become grave at the definite allusion (*παιδιορραντήριον*) to the crime of Atreus.—**ματεύει** f, h, **ἀνευρήσει** Porson.

1080. **μαρτυρίοισι** Pauw, **τοῖσδ' ἐπιπείθομαι** Abresch.

1084. **προφήτας** *i.e. μάρτυρας*, literally *τοὺς λέξοντας ἡμῖν περὶ σοῦ* (schol.) or rather *ὑπὲρ σοῦ*. The word by itself does not mean *μάντις*, though a *μάντις* is *προφήτης θεοῦ*.—**ἦμεν** may be right, as an emphatic repetition of the verb. The speakers, displeased, wish to silence Cassandra, whom they take to be merely displaying her powers, with the assurance that they know them by reputation. **ἤδη** (Housman) is not improbable, nor **τὸ μὲν** for *ἦμεν* in *v.* 1083 (Headlam).—*τούτων προφήτας* Weil: 'prophets (?) of these things'.

1085—1147. She sees in vision from point to point the murder of Agamemnon and her own death.

1092. **ἐκεῖνα**: *τὰ περὶ Θυέστου* schol. See *v.* 1075.

1097. *She*, 'the murderess'.—**χερὸς** later MSS.—*χερὸς ὀρέγματα* Hermann, but see Appendix II.

1099. *To the perplexity of hints has succeeded that of oracles blind. Vv.* 1093—98 are less vague than *vv.* 1085—90, but stop short (*v.* 1095), as if the seer could not see her way.

1102. She sees the enfolding of the king in the robe (*v.* 1381).

1103. **τι Ἅιδου** Dindorf.

1104. The murderess herself is the true snare: *δίκτυον* properly a *cast-net*, *ἄρκυς* a *stake-net*, but the distinction must not be pressed.—**ἡ ξύνευνος, ἡ ξυναιτία** *the*

φόνου στάσις δ' ἀκόρεστος γένει
κατολολυξάτω
θύματος λευσίμου.

ΧΟ. *ποίαν Ἐρινὺν τήνδε δώμασιν κέλει* — *στρ.*
ἐπορθιάζειν; οὔ με† φαιδρύνει λόγος·
ἐπὶ δὲ καρδίαν ἔδραμε κροκοβαφὴς
σταγών, ἅτε καιρία πτώσιμος
ξυνανύτει βίου
δύντος αὐγαῖς· ταχεῖ-
α δ' ἄτα πέλει.

ΚΑ. *ἆ, ἆ, ἰδοὺ ἰδού·* — *ἀντ. ε΄.*
ἄπεχε τῆς βοὸς
τὸν ταῦρον· ἐν πέπλοισιν
μελαγκέρῳ λαβοῦσα μηχανήματι

1111. *καὶ δορία.*

---

partner of the bed, the partner of the crime. **ξύνευνος**: *wife* or *paramour*? Rather both.—**ξυναιτία** is also explained to mean 'accomplice of the *δίκτυον*, of the fatal robe'. This cannot be the whole meaning, as it does not satisfy the correspondence of *ξύνευνος...ξυναιτία*, but it is perhaps suggested also. In such a scene we must not seek explanations too precise. The language is not meant to be clear.—Others punctuate thus ... *ξυναιτία φόνου. στάσις...*: but see next note.

1105. **φόνου στάσις** *Chorus of Death.* *φόνου* is necessary; without definition *στάσις* would not suggest the following question *ποίαν Ἐρινύν;*—**ἀκόρεστος** (*φόνου*) **γένει**: literally 'insatiable of blood, to the race'.—**ἀκόρετος** Bothe, perhaps rightly, though the form is not extant, nor (in my opinion) proved. See Appendix II.

1107. **κατολολυξάτω θύματος λευσίμου** *raise the solemn cry over sacrifice to be slain by stoning.* The context suggests that **θῦμα λεύσιμον** should mean the murder, called so metaphorically, but why, or what to a Greek *θῦμα λεύσιμον* would suggest, is very obscure. Sacrifice by stoning is traceable in tradition. Thus at Condylea in Arcadia the name of the local goddess *Artemis the Strangled* (*Ἀπαγχομένη*) was explained by a story that some children, having in play pretended to strangle the image with a rope, were *stoned*, and the people suffered plagues in consequence, till they consulted the Pythia, who condemned the stoning of the children and imposed expiations (Pausanias 8. 23. 6). At Troezen again a feast called *Λιθοβολία* was celebrated in honour, it was said, of two virgins from Crete, who in the confusion of a riot were *stoned* by the opposite faction (*στασιασάντων δὲ ὁμοίως τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἁπάντων καὶ ταύτας φασὶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιστασιωτῶν καταλευσθῆναι* Paus. 2. 32. 2). These stories apparently refer to former customs of human sacrifice; and at Troezen the persons by whom the rite was performed were called a *στάσις* (at least this would account for the story about *στασιῶται*), which may throw light upon *στάσις* here. In human sacrifices

Now let the Chorus of Death, who thirst for the blood of the race, raise their ritual cry over their victim stoned.

Eld. What fiend is this, whom thou biddest sing triumph over the house? Thou lookest not glad thyself at the word. Gone to thy heart is the pale drop, even such as from a mortal wound drips slow and slower, when life's light sets and death is coming quick.

Cass. Ah! Ah! See, see!......

Keep the bull from the cow! She hath caught him in a vesture, and gores him with her black, crafty horn. He falls in

---

stoning would be a technical way of avoiding the pollution of bloodshed (since the act is not done by any one hand and does not necessarily shed the blood as *σφαγή* does). It seems therefore not impossible that the murder is compared to a 'sacrifice by stoning' or human sacrifice, over which the ring of fiends, who perform it, are bidden to rejoice.—To refer *θῦμα λεύσιμον* to the imagined stoning of *Clytaemnestra* by the people is unsatisfactory. The death of Clytaemnestra is not here relevant, and a false prediction would spoil the effect. —*λουσίμου* (an allusion to the bath) E. A. L. M. (*Class. Rev.* v. p. 388): *γευσίμου toothsome*, Tucker, *ib.* XI. 404.

1109. **οὔ με**: see next note.

1110—1114. **καιρία πτώσιμος** Dindorf, literally 'shed so as to be mortal', see *v.* 1342: **καὶ δορὶ πτώσιμος**, 'even such as from a spear-wound', is also possible.—**ξυνανύτει ... αὐγαῖς** literally 'ceases (dripping) as the light ceases', the wound ceasing to bleed as the eyes close in death.—**ταχεῖα δ' ἄτα πέλει.** For the independent clause see *v.* 1089 *ἀλλὰ δέ κτλ.* 'while help is far'.—The description is of one seized with intense horror and turning, as we say, 'pale as death'. The paleness of the dying face is attributed to 'pale' blood.—With *οὔ με φαιδρύνει*, this description might seem to refer to the speaker himself. The transition to such terrible emotion on the part of the Chorus would be strangely sudden, nor does their next speech (*v.* 1122) show any such feeling, but expresses as before merely bewilderment and vague apprehension. Perhaps therefore we should read **οὐ σὲ**, 'thou lookest not glad *thyself* at what thou sayest'. And in any case the description must refer to Cassandra, to whom the vision now begins to show the striking of the murderous stroke.

1118. *With her crafty weapon, her black horn.*—**μηχανήματι**: the axe.—**μελαγκέρῳ** does not mean that the *μηχάνημα* is black-horned, but that it is, as it were, a black horn.—Dr Wecklein, reading *ἐν πέπλων νιν μελαγκέρῳ κτλ.*, takes the *μελαγκέρων μηχάνημα* to be the enveloping robe, which, as Agamemnon stretches out his arms in it, 'has an appearance as of something black-horned'. In favour of this it must be admitted that *λαβοῦσα*, if not constructed with *μελαγκέρῳ μηχανήματι*, is irregularly placed. Nor is the grotesqueness of the conception objectionable. But it is difficult not to suppose that the horn which gores is the axe which strikes.—It has also been referred to "the murderess advancing with her head bent down and shrouded in the black robe which she holds outstretched in her protruded hands", *Class. Rev.* v. p. 388.—The scholia record both **μελαγκέρῳ** and *μελαγκέρων* (*i.e. τὸν μελαγκέρων ταῦρον*).

τύπτει· πίτνει δ' ἐν ἐνύδρῳ τεύχει.
δολοφόνου λέβη-
τος τύχαν σοι λέγω.

ΧΟ. οὐ κομπάσαιμ' ἂν θεσφάτων γνώμων ἄκρος *ἀντ.*
εἶναι, κακῷ δέ τῳ προσεικάζω τάδε.
ἀπὸ δὲ θεσφάτων τίς ἀγαθὰ φάτις
βροτοῖς στέλλεται; κακῶν γὰρ διαὶ
πολυεπεῖς τέχναι
θεσπιῳδὸν φόβον
φέρουσιν μαθεῖν.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ ἰὼ ταλαίνας *στρ. ζ'.*
κακόποτμοι τύχαι.
τὸ γὰρ ἐμὸν θροῶ
πάθος ἐπεγχέασα.
ποῖ δή με δεῦρο τὴν τάλαιναν ἤγαγες,
οὐδέν ποτ' εἰ μὴ ξυνθανουμένην· τί γάρ;

ΧΟ. φρενομανής τις εἶ θεοφόρητος, ἀμ- *στρ. α'.*
φὶ δ' αὑτᾶς θροεῖς
νόμον ἄνομον, οἷά τις ξουθὰ
ἀκόρεστος βοᾶς, φεῦ,
ταλαίναις φρεσὶν
Ἴτυν Ἴτυν στένουσ' ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοῖς
ἀηδὼν βίον.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ ἰὼ λιγείας *ἀντ. ζ'.*
μόρον ἀηδόνος.
περέβαλον γάρ οἱ

1119. Omits *ἐν*. 1125. *διὰ*. 1143. *ἀηδόνος μόρον*.
1144. *περεβάλοντο γὰρ οἱ*.

1119. **ἐν ἐνύδρῳ**: Schütz.—**τεύχει**: *κύτει* Blomfield. See Appendix II.

1123. **εἶναι**: see *vv.* 1047, 1079, 'A very good judge of the oracular I cannot boast that I *am*, but' etc.

1125. **κακῶν διαὶ** (Hermann): '*through* woes' *i.e.* 'in woe *throughout*'.—**τέχναι**: the 'science' or 'skill' of the *μάντις*: cf. *τέχναι Κάλχαντος* in *v.* 260; the reference is particularly (as *πολυεπεῖς* shows; see *ἔπος, ἔπη*) to the phraseology and metrical form of prophetic utterance. The art of the *μάντις* was just beginning to decline in repute among the educated in the time of Aeschylus.

1132. **ἐπεγχέασα**: 'as a drop' or

a vessel of water. In a treacherous murderous caldron is done the thing I tell thee.

Eld. I cannot boast high skill in judging words inspired; but these I judge to figure some ill. But by this way what good word ever is sent to man? It is all ill, a skill of manifold phrases, offering for knowledge a terrifying chant.

Cass. Alas, alas, for the hapless doom of a wretch, for mine own fate! It shall have its drop in the lament.

Where is this thou hast brought me, a hapless wretch, just only to die with thee, and nothing more?

Eld. Thou art in some sort crazed by the god who hurries thy thoughts, and wailest thyself in a wild tune, like some brown nightingale, that with singing never sated laments, alas, heart-sore, for Itys, Itys, all her sorrow-filled days.

Cass. O, but to die as a musical nightingale! For her the

'ingredient more' added to the lament for the king. See a somewhat similar metaphor in *v.* 17.—Of the corrections proposed to adjust the metre to the antistrophe, **ἐπεγχέαι** 'so as to pour it on' (Campbell, Sidgwick) is the least violent, but the grammar is dubious. **ἐπεγχύδαν** Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XII. 247), supposing the participle to be an explanatory note, and citing *οὐ διαρρύδαν· ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐ διαρρέων Cho.* 65 schol., etc. See however Appendix II.

1133. An apostrophe to Agamemnon (Paley), not to Apollo: the king is already in her mind, *τὸ ἐμόν* in *v.* 1131 being antithetic to *τὸ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος*: and note *ξυνθανουμένην* (*σοι*). On the stage, action would explain.—**ἤγαγες** points to the name *Ἀγ-αμέμνων*: see *v.* 1071.

1134. **τί γάρ**; *what else?*

1138. **ἀκόρετος** *Ald.* See on *v.* 1105.

1140. **ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοῖς** together, *sorrow-filled.*

1144—1147. **περέβαλον**, the 'Aeolic' form for *περιέβαλον*, should be retained (Wecklein, comparing *Eum.* 637 *περεσκήνωσεν* M).—**γάρ** (?). Perhaps **τό γε**, the article, or rather demonstrative pronoun, used to mark the antithesis. For examples in Homer, where this use of the anticipatory pronoun with various particles is characteristic, see Monro, *Homeric Gramm.* §§ 258—259, and for the combination with the dative pronoun see *e.g.* Herod. 3. 65 *τὸ μὲν δὴ ἔργον ἐξείργασταί μοι...οἱ δὲ ὑμῖν Μάγοι κρατέουσι τῶν βασιληίων.*—The middle *περεβάλοντο* can hardly be right, meaning naturally 'to put *on oneself*'.—**ἀγῶνα**: literally 'a struggle', used, as in Euripides frequently, for what is terrible, critical, or both at once, *e.g. Hec.* 229 *παρέστηχ' ὡς ἔοικ' ἀγὼν μέγας*, *Med.* 366 *ἔτ' εἴσ' ἀγῶνες τοῖς νεωστὶ νυμφίοις*, *Supp.* 71 *ἀγὼν ὅδ' ἄλλος ἔρχεται.* So also *ἀγώνισμα* Eur. *El.* 987 *πικρόν τε χἡδὺ τἀγώνισμά μοι.* Here *agony*, the *quitting of life*; cf. *ἀγωνία agony.* The transformation to a bird was a *γλυκὺς ἀγών.*—**τε**, if right, expresses apposition, 'and therewith a sweet passage'. But perhaps we should read **γε**.—*αἰῶνα* is a conjecture suggested in M, but the antithesis is between the death which awaits Cassandra and the painless transformation of Philomela (Enger); and the 'sweet life' is not the point. — **σχισμὸς** *cleaving, sundering,*

πτεροφόρον δέμας
θεοί, γλυκύν τ' ἀγῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ·
ἐμοὶ δὲ μίμνει σχισμὸς ἀμφήκει δορί.

ΧΟ. πόθεν ἐπισσύτους θεοφόρους τ' ἔχεις — ἀντ. α΄.
ματαίους δύας,
τὰ δ' ἐπίφοβα δυσφάτῳ κλαγγᾷ
μελοτυπεῖς ὁμοῦ τ' ὀρ-
θίοις ἐν νόμοις;
πόθεν ὅρους ἔχεις θεσπεσίας ὁδοῦ
κακορρήμονας;

ΚΑ. ἰὼ γάμοι γάμοι Πάριδος ὀλέθριοι — στρ. η΄.
φίλων. ἰὼ Σκαμάνδρου πάτριον ποτόν·
τότε μὲν ἀμφὶ σὰς ἀιόνας τάλαιν'
ἠνυτόμαν τροφαῖς·
νῦν δ' ἀμφὶ Κωκυτόν τε κἀχερουσίους
ὄχθους ἔοικα θεσπιῳδήσειν τάχα.

ΧΟ. τί τόδε τορὸν ἄγαν ἔπος ἐφημίσω; — στρ. β΄.
νεογνὸς ἀνθρώπων μάθοι.
πέπληγμαι δ' ὑπὸ δήγματι φοινίῳ
†δυσαγγεῖ τύχᾳ μινυρὰ θρεομένας,
θραύματ' ἐμοὶ κλύειν.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ πόνοι πόνοι πόλεος ὀλομένας — ἀντ. η΄.
τὸ πᾶν. ἰὼ πρόπυργοι θυσίαι πατρὸς
πολυκανεῖς βοτῶν ποιονόμων· ἄκος δ'
οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν

1159—the end. Readings of f. 1164. μινύρα κακά.

---

combines the actual *wounding* with the *parting* of soul and body.

1148. **πόθεν ἐπισσύτους θεοφόρους τε,** *whence sent, and by whom imposed*, literally 'god-brought'.—Hermann omits τε.

1151. **ὁμοῦ τε,** *and at the same time*, marks an antithesis. They had called her utterance *νόμον ἄνομον* (*v.* 1137), *a wild tune*, literally 'an unordered order', *νόμος* being properly the *order* or arrangement of notes in a tune. But they are forced to admit that there is 'method in it'.—*ὄρθιος* signifies both *raised* in tone and *straightforward*, and was applied with both associations specially to military march music. The second meaning is here most prominent and suggests the following metaphor of the *road* and the *bourns* or guiding-stones.

1162. *A man new-born might under-*

gods did clothe in a winged form, a sweet passage and a tearless, while I must be parted by the steel's sharp edge.

Eld. Whence sent, by what power imposed, is thy vain agony, that thou shapest that fearful song with words so hard and harsh and yet with a march so clear? How findest thou the terms of woe which guide thine inspired way?

Cass. Alas, for the bridal of Paris, the doom of his kin! Ah, sweet Scamander, my native stream! Once on thy banks, ah me, was I nursed and grew. But now by the River of Wailing, aye, and of Woe, my prophet-voice, methinks, will be uttered soon.

Eld. What is this word thou hast spoken, only too plain? A man new-born might understand. I bleed beneath the wound of the piteous singer's breaking misery, which shatters me to hear it.

Cass. Alas, for the labour of Troy, Troy destroyed utterly! Alas, for my father's sacrifices in her behalf, so many grazing victims slain! They served not at all to save the town from

---

stand. The grammar of this sentence is archaic, but, in a proverbial phrase, not inadmissible (see on *v.* 557). **νεογνὸς** is a substantival adjective, *ὁ νεόγονος*. The partitive genitive, or rather genitive 'of distinction from', is the same which survives in the vocative phrases *δῖα γυναικῶν*, *φίλα γυναικῶν* etc., in *ἀριδείκετος ἀνδρῶν* (*Il.* 11. 248), and in the forms of emphasis *κακὰ κακῶν* (*things evil among evils*) etc. (Kühner, *Gr. Grammar* § 414, 5, b): *νεογνὸς* is treated (according to the meaning, *ὁ νεώτατος ἀνθρώπων*) as a superlative; 'a new-born one among human beings' is, in modern phrase, 'the youngest human intelligence'.—Lastly **μάθοι** falls under the following use. "From acquiescence or willingness that something shall happen, the optative passes to *admission of possibility*, *i.e.* willingness to *suppose* or believe that the thing will happen...*Od.* 3. 231 *ῥεῖα θεός γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σαώσαι*. This is said as a concession: 'we men must allow that a god can save even from afar'" (Monro, *Homeric Grammar* § 299 f.). Precisely so here: the meaning of the proverb is not *this is intelligible*, but *this must be allowed to be intelligible* or *I can no longer complain of obscurity*. See further Appendix II., and for proposed changes Wecklein's Appendix.

1163. **ὑπὸ** (*ὑπαὶ* h, *ὅπως* Hermann) may conceivably be an imitation of the Homeric *ὑπὸ̄ δείσας* etc., which though really explained by the digamma (*ὑπὸ δϝείσας*) must have seemed to Aeschylus an arbitrary lengthening by the ictus.—**ὑπὸ** is adverb, *quasi ὑποπέπληγμαι*.

1164. Perhaps **δυσαγεῖ**. For the metaphors in *δυσαγεῖ...θραύματα* cf. the Homeric *ἐπεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ*.—For *δυσᾱγής* from *ἀγή breaking* (*ἄγνυμι*) cf. *δυστυχής, τύχη*.—**δυσαλγεῖ** Canter.—**θραύματα...κλύειν** literally 'a shattering to hear'.—**μινυρὰ θρεομένας** Schütz: *κακά* appears to be an explanation.

1167. **πρόπυργοι** *before the town* or *on behalf of the town* (Blomfield)? Probably it would be truest to say that the first meaning is first intended, and then

τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχειν παθεῖν,
ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνους τάχ᾽ ἐμπέδῳ βαλῶ.

ΧΟ. ἑπόμενα προτέροις τάδ᾽ ἐπεφημίσω. ἀντ. β΄.
καί τίς σε κακοφρονεῖν τίθη-
σι δαίμων ὑπερβαρὴς ἐμπίτνων,
μελίζειν πάθη γοερὰ θανατοφόρα·
τέρμα δ᾽ ἀμηχανῶ.

ΚΑ. καὶ μὴν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ᾽ ἐκ καλυμμάτων
ἔσται δεδορκὼς νεογάμου νύμφης δίκην,
λαμπρὸς δ᾽ ἔοικεν ἡλίου πρὸς ἀντολὰς
πνέων ἐσήξειν, ὥστε κύματος δίκην
κλύειν πρὸς αὐγὰς τοῦδε πήματος πολὺ
μεῖζον· φρενώσω δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων.
καὶ μαρτυρεῖτε συνδρόμως ἴχνος κακῶν
ῥινηλατούσῃ τῶν πάλαι πεπραγμένων.
τὴν γὰρ στέγην τήνδ᾽ οὔποτ᾽ ἐκλείπει χορὸς
ξύμφθογγος οὐκ εὔφωνος· οὐ γὰρ εὖ λέγει.
καὶ μὴν πεπωκώς γ᾽, ὡς θρασύνεσθαι πλέον,
βρότειον αἷμα κῶμος ἐν δόμοις μένει,
δύσπεμπτος ἔξω, ξυγγόνων Ἐρινύων.
ὑμνοῦσι δ᾽ ὕμνον δώμασιν† προσήμεναι·
πρώταρχος ἄτην ἐν μέρει δ᾽ ἀπέπτυσαν,
εὐνὰς ἀδελφοῦ τῷ πατοῦντι δυσμενεῖς.

1172. ἐφημίσω. 1178. νύμφας. 1186. σύμ φογγος.

---

the second assumed by a tacit shifting of thought.

1170. **τὸ μὴ κτλ.** As the principal sentence (*οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν*) is negative, regular usage would require in the consecutive clause *μὴ οὐ*.—**ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχειν παθεῖν**: *i.e. ἔχειν παθεῖν ὥσπερ οὖν* (*ἔχει παθεῖν*), 'to save the city from receiving such treatment as in fact she is receiving'. This sentence, if rightly given by *Florentinus* and *Venetus*, is analogous to the use of *ὅστις δήποτε*, *e.g. ἔπαθες ὅ τι δήποτε* (*ἔπαθες*) 'you have been treated as you have been': but no parallel use of *ὥσπερ οὖν* seems to be found.—The *Cod. Farn.* offers the conjecture *ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει παθεῖν*. Dr Wecklein objects that we should require either *ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει ἔχειν* or *ὥσπερ οὖν ἔπαθε παθεῖν*, as in *v.* 1287 *πράξασαν ὡς ἔπραξεν*, Soph. *O. T.* 1376 *βλαστοῦσ᾽ ὅπως ἔβλαστεν* etc. He suggests *ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχειν ἔχει* (*i.e. ἔχειν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει*).

1171. See Appendix V.

1172. **ἐπεφημίσω** Paley.

1173. **τίς**: 'and there is *some* power

such fate as now it hath; and I, the sick-brained, I shall soon be sent after the wise.

Eld. Thy latter words go along with those before. Some power there is who with over-bearing press maddens thee to sing of sorrows tending to death, though the end I cannot see.

Cass. See now, my prophecy shall not any more be like a bride new-wed looking forth from a veil. It shall come in bright as a fresh wind, blowing toward sunrise, and rolling wave-like against the light a woe far higher than this now. My teaching shall be by riddles no longer. And be ye witnesses with how close a scent I run in the track of the crimes done long ago.

For out of that house there never departs a choir of voices in unison not sweet, for the words are not fair. Aye, and they have drunk, to be the bolder, of human blood, and in the house they abide, hard to be turned away, a rout of sister-fiends. They besiege the chambers (?) and sing their song, with still-repeated burden denouncing the hated sin of him who defiled a brother's bed.

---

which' etc., *i.e.* there is inspiration in this and not mere wildness.—**κακοφρονεῖν τίθησι...μελίζειν** *maddens thee...to sing*, *quasi κακοφρονεῖν τίθησιν, ὥστε μελίζειν*, the infinitives being accumulated, which, separated as they are, is not objectionable. For the construction of *τίθημι* see L. and Sc. *s.v.* B. I. 4.—*κακοφρονῶν*, *in malice*, Schütz.—**τέρμα** *goal*, the same metaphor as in *v.* 1153.

1179. The metaphor changes to that of a strong wind at morning, under which the rolling waves of the sea are seen against the light of dawn. Cassandra, it may seem, recalls her recent voyage and the opening of this day. "**λαμπρός**: the Greeks called a strong wind *bright*, so here in any other language two words are required, one to be in antithesis to *ἐκ καλυμμάτων*, the other to suit the new metaphor of wind". Sidgwick.

1180. **ἐσῄξειν**: 'its *coming in*' or '*entry* shall be as of a clear fresh wind'. The expression is influenced by the remembrance marked in the previous note.—*ἐσᾴξειν* Bothe.

1181. **κλύειν**, *i.e.* *κλύζειν*, and perhaps an alternative form: cf. the analogous pairs *βλύω—βλύζω, φλύω—φλύζω*.—*ἴλλειν* J. A. Platt, *Class. Rev.* XI. p. 96.

1187. **ὡς**: *ὥστε*.

1189. **κῶμος Ἐρινύων...βρότειον αἷμα ...ὕμνον**: the figure foreshadows the Chorus of the *Eumenides*.

1190. **δώμασιν προσήμεναι** *besieging the chambers* (cf. *πύργοις προσῆσθαι*) not 'sitting *in* the house'. **ἐν δόμοις** (*v.* 1188) therefore apparently means 'in the fore-court (*αὐλή*)', or perhaps in the hall (*μέγαρον*), *δώματα* being the *inner* rooms. But there is probably some error.—*πώμασιν προσήμεναι*, *sitting at their cups* (cf. *κώπῃ προσήμενος v.* 1617), is possible.—*αἵμασιν προσήμεναι* or *δώμασιν προσημένην* (with *ἄτην v.* 1191) Weil.

1191. **πρώταρχος...ἐν μέρει δέ** *i.e.* *πρώταρχος μὲν ἐν μέρει δέ*, literally 'beginning and in succession' or 'in succession from the first beginner'. The term *ἄρχειν* (*ὕμνου, ἀοιδῆς*, etc.) was conventional and almost technical; see *e.g.* Pindar, *Nem.* 3. 4—10 *μένοντί* (*σε*) *μελι-*

ἥμαρτον; ἢ τηρῶ τι τοξότης τις ὥς;
ἢ ψευδόμαντίς εἰμι θυροκόπος φλέδων;
ἐκμαρτύρησον προὐμόσας τό μ' εἰδέναι
λόγῳ παλαιὰς τῶνδ' ἁμαρτίας δόμων.

ΧΟ. καὶ πῶς ἂν ὅρκος, πῆμα γενναίως παγέν,
παιώνιον γένοιτο; θαυμάζω δέ σου,
πόντου πέραν τραφεῖσαν ἀλλόθρουν πόλιν
κυρεῖν λέγουσαν ὥσπερ εἰ παρεστάτεις.

ΚΑ. μάντις μ' Ἀπόλλων τῷδ' ἐπέστησεν τέλει....
προτοῦ μὲν αἰδὼς ἦν ἐμοὶ λέγειν τάδε....

γαρύων τέκτονες κώμων νεανίαι...ἄρχε δ' οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ, πολυδόκιμον ὕμνον: especially where as here there was a repetition and a burden to the song; so in Theocritus I. *ἄρχετε βωκολικᾶς, Μῶσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς.*—**ἄτην...ἀπέπτυσαν** *they abominate the sin*, cry against it. The common formula of disgust was not *ἀποπτύω* but *ἀπέπτυσα.*—**εὐνὰς ἀδελφοῦ** may be taken in apposition to *ἄτην*, the accusative to *πατοῦντι* being supplied from it, or, perhaps better, simply with *πατοῦντι*, *the defiler of a brother's bed*, the order being arranged to emphasize the words *εὐνὰς ἀδελφοῦ.*—**δυσμενεῖς** "can be nominative or accusative, but it is better nominative, being (as Enger and Schneidewin observe) a grim allusion to their name *Εὐμενίδες*" (Sidgwick).—The reference is to the adultery of Thyestes with the wife of Atreus; Atreus avenged himself by the 'banquet', for which in return vengeance is now about to be taken.—*πρώταρχον ἄτην*, depending on *ὑμνοῦσι*, *they sing of the original crime*, the conjecture of Triclinius (*Cod. Farn.*), seems to distinguish between the 'original' crime and the succeeding (*ἐν μέρει*) sin of Thyestes, and is generally explained by reference to earlier legends. But for the purpose of this play Atreus and Thyestes are the starting point. We should not introduce here an obscure reference to stories which Aeschylus does not notice.

1193. **τηρῶ** 'watch for an opportunity' is used with phrases expressing the nature of the opportunity (a favourable moment, a wind, a dark night, etc.), and here absolutely, the nature of the opportunity, the time to shoot, being implied by the context. The metaphor is the same as in 'to speak *circumspectly*'. The second question (*τηρῶ τι;*) corrects the metaphor of the first (*ἥμαρτον;*). 'Missing' implies 'aiming', conjecture, or *taking a shot.* But Cassandra *knows* (*v.* 1195): and this, she says, may be seen in the manner of her affirmation. The quack will be vague at first and not hazard anything till he gets a hint; he will 'watch, like one that shooteth'. Not so Cassandra, who in *εὐνὰς ἀδελφοῦ* has gone without hesitation to a fact ancient, secret, and *definite.* Therefore she *knows.* The eagerness of the prophetess that her reputation should be attested is not the least pathetic feature in the situation.—**εἰδέναι** opposed to *τοπάζειν* as in *v.* 1368 and *P. V.* 947 *ἐγὼ τάδ' οἶδα.*—**λόγῳ παλαιὰς** *old in story.*—If the emphatic meaning of *εἰδέναι* be missed, there is no connexion here. Hence the suspicion of *τηρῶ* (*κυρῶ* Ahrens), it being supposed that *v.* 1193 should mean 'Do I miss or hit?' Hence also *τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι λόγῳ*

Have I missed? Or do I at all take observation, like one that aimeth a shot? Or am I a false prophet, who babbles from door to door? Bear witness, swearing first, that I do verily *know* the ancient sins in the story of this house.

Eld. And how could an oath do good, being framed in its nature to hurt? But I find it strange in thee, that bred beyond the sea thou shouldst be as right about an alien city, as if thou hadst been there present.

Cass. The prophet-god it was who gave me this power, for...The time hath been when I dared not speak of it....

(Hermann), translated 'that I do not know by report' (τό μ' εἰδέναι μὴ λόγῳ ?). But Cassandra has done nothing to disprove, if it be supposed likely, that she knew the facts λόγῳ.

1197. **πῆμα γενναίως παγέν** *framed naturally to be a hurt.* **γενναίως**: 'according to its γέννα or nature', cf. Aristotle, *Hist. An.* 1. 1. 14 τὸ γενναῖόν ἐστι τὸ μὴ ἐξιστάμενον ἐκ τῆς αὑτοῦ φύσεως, and Hom. *Il.* 5. 253 οὔ μοι γενναῖον ἀλυσκάζοντι μάχεσθαι (L. and Sc. *s.v.*). The meaning is this: the essence of a ὅρκος is that it causes the person swearing falsely to suffer certain penalties; so Hesiod (*Theog.* 792) calls the Styx, as ὅρκος θεῶν, μέγα πῆμα θεοῖσι: *except in the case of falsehood it does not act at all*, and in that case, as was and still is the belief of superstition, *it acts mechanically* and without regard to qualifying considerations, such as *bona fides.* No one therefore should swear to a thing unless he is compelled to do so or has an object to gain. The speaker therefore prudently declines to swear to Cassandra's supernatural knowledge (which is not exactly proved after all), as the oath, he says, could do no good and would only expose the swearer unnecessarily to the danger of falsehood.—**παιώνιον** 'a thing of remedy'; the neuter better suits the antithesis between παιώνιον and πῆμα.—πῆγμα γενναίως παγέν (*a compact* (?) *honestly ratified*), Auratus.

1198. **θαυμάζω δέ.** They admit that her accuracy is surprising.—**σου**: construed as in θαυμάζω τί τινος 'to wonder at something *in* a person'. Here the accusative is represented by the following sentence κυρεῖν κτλ.—σε Auratus.

1199. **ἀλλόθρουν ...... ὥσπερ κτλ.**: 'should be as right on the subject of an alien town as if' etc.—**κυρεῖν** absolutely, *to hit.*—**ἀλλόθρουν πόλιν.** The object of λέγουσαν (the theme *spoken of*, cf. λέγων χειμῶνα *v.* 653) is accommodated by a bold compression of phrase to εἰ παρεστάτεις: *quasi* λέγουσαν τὰ ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει γενόμενα, ὥσπερ εἰ παρῆσθα οὗπερ ἐγένετο.

1201. For better warrant of her prophetic power, she begins to relate from whom and how dearly she purchased it, but pauses in an agony of shame. The Argives, who have heard the story by rumour (*v.* 1083), prompt her with a question, observing, as an excuse for pressing her, that delicacy was better suited to her former condition than her present! In spite of their sympathy they insist on gratifying their Greek (perhaps rather Athenian) curiosity. We may compare the scene in which the men of Colonus insist on forcing a confession from the reluctant Oedipus (Soph. *O.C.* 510 foll.). Here the woman sacrifices her modesty to her intense desire for belief.—On the text and explanation of the story see Appendix W.

ΧΟ. μῶν καὶ θεός περ ἱμέρῳ πεπληγμένος;
ἁβρύνεται γὰρ πᾶς τις εὖ πράσσων πλέον.
ΚΑ. ...ἀλλ' ἦν παλαιστὴς κάρτ' ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν.
ΧΟ. ἦ καὶ τέκνων εἰς ἔργον ἤλθετον νόμῳ;
ΚΑ. ξυναινέσασα Λοξίαν ἐψευσάμην.
ΧΟ. ἤδη τέχναισιν ἐνθέοις ᾑρημένη;
ΚΑ. ἤδη πολίταις πάντ' ἐθέσπιζον πάθη.
ΧΟ. πῶς δῆτ' ἄνακτος ἦσθα Λοξίου κότῳ;
ΚΑ. ἔπειθον οὐδέν' οὐδέν, ὡς τάδ' ἤμπλακον.
ΧΟ. ἡμῖν γε μὲν δὴ πιστὰ θεσπίζειν δοκεῖς.
ΚΑ. ἰοὺ ἰού, ὦ ὦ κακά.
ὑπ' αὖ με δεινὸς ὀρθομαντείας πόνος
στροβεῖ ταράσσων φροιμίοις—ἐφημένους...
ὁρᾶτε; ...τούσδε...τοὺς δόμοις ἐφημένους...
νέους, ὀνείρων προσφερεῖς μορφώμασιν.
παῖδες θανόντες ὡσπερεὶ πρὸς τῶν φίλων,
χεῖρας κρεῶν πλήθοντες οἰκείας βορᾶς
σὺν ἐντέροις τε σπλάγχν', ἐποίκτιστον γέμος,
πρέπουσ' ἔχοντες, ὧν πατὴρ ἐγεύσατο.
ἐκ τῶνδε ποινὰς φημὶ βουλεύειν τινὰ
λέοντ' ἄναλκιν ἐν λέχει στρωφώμενον
οἰκουρόν, οἴμοι, τῷ μολόντι, δεσπότῃ

1220. γέμ. (:ο)

1204 answers the scruple expressed in *v.* 1202, but it is not necessary to change the positions of *v.* 1202 and *v.* 1203. **γὰρ** introduces not a proof of what has been said, but a justification for saying it, for putting the preceding question.

1205. She continues, with an effort; **ἀλλὰ** answers to *μέν* in *v.* 1202.

1213. The agony of prophecy comes upon her again.

1214. *δῖνος* M. Schmidt, Wecklein.—**ὑπό**, an adverb, signifying the *unseen* and *gradual* coming on of the fit.

1215. **φροιμίοις**, *beginning* of greater pain to come, as in *Theb.* 7.—**ἐφημένους**. May we not object to the general assumption that this word has come in by error from the next line? No doubt at *φροιμίοις* the sentence, though grammatically complete, is rhythmically incomplete: a full stop after the fourth foot is rare, and *φροιμίοις* wants an epithet. Also the sentence *ἐφημένους κτλ.* is mis-shapen and disarranged. But all this is part of the intended effect. Suddenly, in the very midst of her pain, the vision itself bursts upon her, and she points to it with broken exclamations.

Eld. For Apollo's self desired thee. Was it so? We are all more delicate in prosperity.

Cass. Yea, then, he wrought with me, and mighty was his charm.

Eld. And came ye too to the deed of kind in natural course?

Cass. I promised, but kept not faith with Loxias.

Eld. And had he won thee with inspiration already given?

Cass. Yes, already I prophesied to my people all that befell them.

Eld. How could the wrath of Loxias retrieve thee then?

Cass. After I did that wrong, I could never make any believe me.

Eld. To us however thou seemest a prophet worthy belief.

Cass. Ah!...Oh agony!

Again the fearful pangs of present vision grow on me, whirling my soul in a confused beginning of—There!...Sitting there!...do ye see them? Sitting before the house!...young children, like forms in a dream.

As infants slain by their parents they appear, their hands full of that meat of which he ate, whose own flesh it was, carrying, oh pitiable burden!, the hearts and inward parts, of which their father tasted.

And hence the vengeance, plotted, I tell you, now by a certain lion of a craven sort, who haunting the couch hath watched at home for him, alas, who is come, who is lord—for

---

1216. **ὁρατε**; best taken (with Hermann) as a question.—**δόμοις ἐφημένους** 'sitting before' the house, *i.e.* as suppliants at the door, or at the altar before the door; see *βρέτας ἐφήμενος*, *Eum.* 412. For the construction cf. *ἐφεστάναι πύλαις to stand at a gate*, *ἐφεστάναι πόλει to lie before a city* (of an army), and see *Theb.* 525.

1218. *Like children slain by those that should love them.* This, with the reference to *dream-phantoms*, seems to presume a belief that the children of infanticides haunted the house in this way, a belief very natural where, as in the historic age of Greece, infanticide was permitted but disliked.—**τε** couples *πλήθοντες* with *ἔχοντες*, and *παῖδες...φίλων* is a separate clause, qualifying the whole sentence and explained by what precedes.

1219. **οἰκείας βορᾶς**: because the flesh of the children was the flesh of the father himself.

1224. **δεσπότῃ...ζυγόν.** The appellation and humble acknowledgment have here a bitterly ironical effect.

ἐμῷ· φέρειν γὰρ χρὴ τὸ δούλιον ζυγόν.
νεῶν τ' ἄπαρχος Ἰλίου τ' ἀναστάτης
οὐκ οἶδεν οἷα γλῶσσα μισητῆς κυνός,
λέξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην
ἄτης λαθραίου, τεύξεται κακῇ τύχῃ.
τοιάδε τόλμα, θῆλυς ἄρσενος φονεύς.
ἔστιν—τί νιν καλοῦσα δυσφιλὲς δάκος
τύχοιμ' ἄν; ἀμφίσβαιναν, ἢ Σκύλλαν τινὰ
οἰκοῦσαν ἐν πέτραισι, ναυτίλων βλάβην,
θύουσαν Ἅιδου μητέρ'† ἄσπονδόν τ' ἀρὰν
φίλοις πνέουσαν; ὡς δ' ἐπωλολύξατο
ἡ παντότολμος, ὥσπερ ἐν μάχης τροπῇ,
δοκεῖ δὲ χαίρειν νοστίμῳ σωτηρίᾳ.
καὶ τῶνδ' ὅμοιον εἴ τι μὴ πείθω· τί γάρ;
τὸ μέλλον ἥξει. καὶ σὺ μὴν τάχει παρὼν
ἄγαν γ' ἀληθόμαντιν οἰκτείρας ἐρεῖς.

1228. *καὶ κτεινᾶσα.* 1230. *τολμᾶ.* 1231. *δυσφιλεύς.*

1226. **νεῶν ... ἀναστάτης**: literally 'being at once discommanded of his fleet and destroyer of Troy'. The conjunctions **τε...τε** mark the connexion of the facts; he is *ἀναστάτης Ἰλίου* and *νεῶν ἄπαρχος* therefore also. The two descriptions are linked by the Trojan captive in bitter satire: the dispersion of the fleet was the direct consequence of the sacrilegious razing (*ἀνάστασις*) of Troy (*vv.* 350, 640), and on the dispersion of the fleet in turn depended the fate of Agamemnon himself (see the Introduction). Here (as at *v.* 532) the poet has in mind the destruction of Athens and its punishment at Salamis.—**ἄπαρχος**: from *ἀρχή*, cf. *ἀπόπολις*, *ἀποστράτηγος* etc., a privative governing *νεῶν*. Cf. *Cho.* 660 *γυνὴ τ' ἄπαρχος* and note there and (a precise parallel) *Pers.* 330 *Κιλίκων ἄπαρχος*, *having lost the Cilicians whom he commanded*, the Cilician squadron having been destroyed or very severely damaged by the Athenians at Artemisium (Herod. 8. 14). *ἔπαρχος* has been wrongly conjectured in all three places.

1227—1229. **κἀκτείνασα** Canter. **οἷα** adverbial accusative, equivalent to *ὅπως*, qualifying the whole sentence. **λέξασα... λαθραίου** describes the queen's reception of Agamemnon. The expressions are loaded, indeed over-loaded, with double meaning. (1) In relation to *γλῶσσα... λέξασα*, the word *δίκην* means primarily *plea* (cf. *λέγειν δίκην* and *δίκας οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώσσης v.* 804): Clytaemnestra's address (*v.* 846) is a *δίκη* in this sense, an exculpation of herself. In this connexion *ἐκτείνασα* means *lengthening*, and refers to the artificial length of her address, noted by Agamemnon (*v.* 907) in similar terms. But (2) in *ἐκτείνασα δίκην...τεύξεται* there is also involved another sense of *δίκη*, connected with *δίκη justice* very remotely if at all, namely *a cast* (as of a *net*) from *δικεῖν to throw* (cf. *βόλος* from *βάλλειν*, and *δίκτυον*). To *δίκην* in this sense *ἐκτείνειν to reach forth* is literally

the slave must bear the yoke—of me. Little he knows, the destroyer of Ilium, captain of a lost fleet, how the tongue of that lewd creature hath spoken and 'stretched', with joyful thoughts, her 'plea' (and cast!) of treacherous death, which fatally shall reach him! So bold the crime, a woman to slay the man!

She is—ah what should the loveless monster be fitly called? A dragon, a Scylla housed in the rocks, the mariner's bane, a mother of death (?), offering her fell sacrifices even while in the prayer of her soul her husband hath no part. And how the bold wretch raised her cheer, as at the turn of battle, pretending to be glad of the safe coming-home!

And of this how much is believed, it matters not. What is to be will come, nay, soon thou, present thyself, wilt say with compassion 'A prophet only too true!'

---

applicable, and in this metaphor the allusive phrases meet.—**ἄτης λαθραίου** defines *δίκην*, and also determines the meaning of *τεύξεται* *will reach* (*the object*).—I unite the explanations of (1) Mr Macnaghten (*Journal of Philology*, XVI. p. 213) and (2) Prof. Bury (*Classical Rev.* I. 241). See further Appendix X.

1230. **τοιάδε**: so daring, that he cannot suspect it.—**θῆλυς...φονεύς**, where *θῆλυς* is in effect subject and *φονεύς* predicate, stand in loose apposition to *τόλμα*, as in the English.—Others join together *θῆλυς...ἐστίν*, but see next note.—**τόλμα** H. L. Ahrens.

1231. **ἔστιν—τί νιν κτλ.** She pauses for words.

1234. **θύουσαν** refers primarily to the *sacrifices* which play so important a part in the plot. (See particularly *vv.* 592—599 *ἀνωλόλυξα...ὅμως δ' ἔθυον* and note *ἐπωλολύξατο* below.) But **Ἅιδου** suggests also the sense *raging* (from the other *θύω*). The point lies in the ambiguity: her *sacrifice* is the ritual of a *Fury*.—**Ἅιδου μητέρα** (?): a strange expression. Mr Sidgwick translates it by *Dam of Death*, which sounds well; but *Hades* is strictly a personal name, the deity of the lower world. **λήτορα** O. Müller, followed by Wecklein (from Hesychius, *λείτορες· ἱέρειαι*, and *λήτειραι· ἱέρειαι τῶν σεμνῶν θεῶν*: cf. *v.* 736 *ἱερεύς ἄτας*), *priestess of Hades*.

ib. **τε** couples *θύουσαν* to *πνέουσαν*, contrasting them as things which should not co-exist.—**ἄσπονδον ἀρὰν φίλοις.** The dative depends on *ἄσπονδον*. An *ἀρά* created a bond (see *v.* 464) between those who joined in the *σπονδαί* (*libation*) by which it was typified. An *ἀρά* which is *ἄσπονδός τινι* is a prayer in which that person cannot share. The prayers, with which Clytaemnestra secretly accompanied her pretended sacrifice for her husband's return, were curses upon his head and vows for the success of her plot.—**φίλοις**: regularly used in tragedy of the husband or wife.—*Ἄρην*, *Ἄρη* *conjj.*

1236. **ὥσπερ...τροπῇ** *as at the moment of victory*. The figure is from women watching a fight and raising the *ὀλολυγμός* when they see the enemy fly.

1238. Literally 'it is all one if I am as to any point herein not believed'.

1239. **μὴν** *but* marks a climax. The fact can scarcely be called 'future': the elders are there to see it.—**καὶ** emphasizes **σύ**, *thy very self*.

1240. **γε.** As for confirmation of her truth, that *at least* will be only too complete. The object (*με*) is apparently

ΧΟ. τὴν μὲν Θυέστου δαῖτα παιδείων κρεῶν
ξυνῆκα καὶ πέφρικα, καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει
κλύοντ' ἀληθῶς οὐδὲν ἐξῃκασμένα·
τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀκούσας ἐκ δρόμου πεσὼν τρέχω.
ΚΑ. Ἀγαμέμνονός σε φήμ' ἐπόψεσθαι μόρον.
ΧΟ. εὔφημον, ὦ τάλαινα, κοίμησον στόμα.
ΚΑ. ἀλλ' οὔτι παιὼν τῷδ' ἐπιστατεῖ λόγῳ.
ΧΟ. οὔκ, εἰ παρέσται γ'· ἀλλ' μὴ γένοιτό πως.
ΚΑ. σὺ μὲν κατεύχει, τοῖς δ' ἀποκτείνειν μέλει.
ΧΟ. τίνος πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦτ' ἄχος πορσύνεται;
ΚΑ. ἦ κάρτ' ἄρ' ἂν παρεσκόπεις χρησμῶν ἐμῶν.
ΧΟ. τοῦ γὰρ τελοῦντος οὐ ξυνῆκα μηχανήν.
ΚΑ. καὶ μὴν ἄγαν γ' Ἕλλην' ἐπίσταμαι φάτιν.
ΧΟ. καὶ γὰρ τὰ πυθόκραντα· δυσπτγθῆ δ' ὅμως.
ΚΑ. παπαῖ, οἷον τὸ πῦρ· ἐπέρχεται δέ μοι.
ὀτοτοῖ, Λύκει' Ἄπολλον, οἲ ἐγὼ ἐγώ.
αὕτη δίπους λέαινα συγκοιμωμένη
λύκῳ λέοντος εὐγενοῦς ἀπουσίᾳ.

1241. παιδίων. 1251. παρεσκοπεις (η written above).
1254. δυσπαθῆ. 1257. δίπλους.

supplied from εἰ πείθω: but perhaps we should read μ' ἐν (for μὴν Auratus) or μ' (for γε Pauw).

1241. **παιδείων** Schütz.

1243. **ἀληθῶς...ἐξῃκασμένα** *what is in truth no mere likeness.* They admit that her utterances have as she asserts (*v.* 1193) all the precision of reality. Cf. *Theb.* 432.

1244. **ἐκ...τρέχω** *I am thrown off the track*, at a loss.

1246. **εὔφημον.** The presence of the gods of the house, in whose honour a sacrifice is now being performed, makes abstinence from ominous words a religious duty. From the reference to Παιών (*Apollo*) in the answer it appears that they point specially at the *Agyieus* (*v.* 1065).

1247. *Nay, it is not as saviour that he governs this speech*, but as **ἀπόλλων** (see *v.* 1065, and contrast *v.* 517 νῦν... ἴσθι παιώνιος).—**λόγῳ**: what she has said.

1248. *No indeed, if he means to appear; but I trust it shall not be so, i.e.* I trust it is an idle prediction which the god does *not* inspire, and will not see executed. But presently Cassandra beholds the god himself (*v.* 1268). It is to be remembered that Agamemnon, as well as Cassandra, was a sinner against Apollo in having violated his sanctuary. The apparition of the god here at the crisis is a forecast of his leading part in the following plays.—εἴπερ ἔσται, Schütz, assuming that the subject of the verb is ὁ λόγος.

1250. They are thinking of Aegisthus; hence **ἀνδρός**.

1251. *Thou must indeed have missed*

Eld. Thyestes' feast of children's flesh I understood, and shudder. Truly 'tis more than semblance, and it makes me afraid to hear it. But in what else was said I am thrown out of the track.

Cass. I say that thou wilt see Agamemnon dead.

Eld. O hush, poor creature, hush thy profane lips!

Cass. Nay, it is not as a Saviour that He directs this sentence.

Eld. No indeed, if He will be present; but I trust it shall not be so.

Cass. While thou prayest against them, they are busy to slay.

Eld. Who is the man who is contriving this woe?

Cass. Thou must indeed have looked far wide of what I showed!

Eld. 'Tis that I understand not the plan of him who should do it.

Cass. And yet I know the speech of Hellas, only too well.

Eld. Greek are the Pythian oracles, and yet hard to the seeker.

Cass. Oh, this burning fire!...It is creeping over me!...Ah mercy, Apollo Lycêus, mercy upon me!

See the lioness two-footed, that couches with the wolf while the noble lion is away! She will slay me, wretch that I am!

---

clean the purport of my revelation, literally 'must have looked much wide of (παρά)'. For the tense with ἄν see *v.* 924 and note there.—By the caesural division of παρ-εσκόπεις an emphasis may be thrown upon παρά (as an adverb); cf. *Theb.* 525. In fact παρεσκόπεις is not one word but two. See however the observations of Dr Headlam, *On editing Aeschylus*, p. 16. I hope to return to the subject in connexion with the *Persae*.—ἦ κάρτα τἄρα παρεκόπης Hartung.

1252. Literally 'of the person likely to perform it I do not understand the instrument', *i.e.* 'I do not see how he, whom I should naturally suspect of the design, has any means of executing it'. ὁ τελῶν is Aegisthus, as in *v.* 1250. It would be impossible that the elders, knowing what they do, should not have their minds turned in this direction by Cassandra's words. But as they say, what they do not comprehend is how the adulterers *can* act. The μηχανή is the conspiracy.

1253. **ἄγαν γε**: by the fatal inspiration of Apollo, which adds a point to the next verse.

1254. **δυσπυθῆ** *hard to enquire of, hard to learn*, from πυθέσθαι: cf. εὐπιθής.—**δυσμαθῆ** Stephanus.

1255. **ἐπέρχεται** *it is coming*, the prophetic seizure.

1257. **δίπους** Victorius.—**αὕτη** *See there...!* It is better to stop the sentence at ἀπουσίᾳ.

κτενεῖ με τὴν τάλαιναν· ὡς δὲ φάρμακον
τεύχουσα κἀμοῦ μισθὸν ἐνθήσει κότῳ.
ἐπεύχεται θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον
ἐμῆς ἀγωγῆς ἀντιτίσασθαι φόνον.
τί δῆτ' ἐμαυτῆς καταγέλωτ' ἔχω τάδε,
καὶ σκῆπτρα καὶ μαντεῖα περὶ δέρῃ στέφη;
σὲ μὲν πρὸ μοίρας τῆς ἐμῆς διαφθερῶ.
ἴτ' ἐς φθόρον πεσόντ' ἀγαθῷ δ' ἀμείβομαι.†
ἄλλην τιν' ἄτην ἀντ' ἐμοῦ πλουτίζετε.
ἰδοὺ δ' Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς ἐκδύων ἐμὲ
χρηστηρίαν ἐσθῆτ'· ἐποπτεύσας δέ με
κἀν τοῖσδε κόσμοις καταγελωμένην μετά,
φίλων ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως, μάτην
(καλουμένη δέ, φοιτὰς ὥς, ἀγύρτρια
πτωχὸς τάλαινα λιμοθνὴς ἠνεσχόμην),
καὶ νῦν ὁ μάντις μάντιν ἐκπράξας ἐμὲ
ἀπήγαγ' ἐς τοιάσδε θανασίμους τύχας.
βωμοῦ πατρῴου δ' ἀντ' ἐπίξηνον μένει

1266. ἀμείβομαι (corr. to ἀμείψομαι).

1259—1260. *She brews, as it were, a medicine for her wrath and will add to it* (as an ingredient) *also the recompense for me, i.e.* the revenge for the insult done to her as a wife. **κότῳ**, dative 'of interest', belongs to the whole sentence, both to *τεύχουσα* and to *ἐνθήσει*, the *wrath, i.e.* the craving for vengeance, being personified as the patient to be cured.—*ποτῷ* (Auratus) leaves *φάρμακον* obscure. —The abrupt recommencement **ἐπεύχεται κτλ.** is effective and in character (*vv.* 1218, 1222, 1226, 1267).

1264. **σκῆπτρα...στέφη**: at each word she dashes down the thing named.—**σκῆπτρα** her divining wands.—**στέφη** fillets of wool.

1265. **σὲ**: some other object, uncertain without the scenic explanation, "an image of Apollo, I guess, which she wore on her head or breast" (Munro, *J. Ph.* XI. 140).

1266. See Appendix Y.

1267. Literally 'enrich another kind of destruction in return for the destruction of me'. **ἄτην πλουτίζετε** *enrich Destruction, i.e.* 'be destroyed', as in Soph. *O. T.* 30 *Ἅιδης στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις πλουτίζεται*, but here with more point in so far as the notion of *πλοῦτος* is literally appropriate to the insignia.—**ἄλλην τινά** (in prose usage *ἑτέραν τινά*) marks the fanciful analogy. If the insignia cannot be *killed*, like Cassandra, they can at least be *spoiled*.—**ἀντ' ἐμοῦ**, as in the *comparatio compendiaria*, for *ἀντὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ἄτης*. She expresses more precisely the idea of *ἀμείβομαι* in *v.* 1266.—Suggested changes (*ἄτης* Hermann, etc.) assume the meaning 'Bestow yourselves on another'. But the insignia are not to go to another; they are to be destroyed.

1270. Lit. 'mocked even in this dress along with it'. As in *v.* 591 and

Brewing as it were a medicine for her wrath, she will add to it also the recompense for me. She vows as she sharpens her man-slaying sword, to take of him for the bringing of me a bloody revenge.

Why then in derision of myself do I bear these, the sceptre of divination, and the stole about my neck?

Thee at least I will destroy ere I perish myself!

Down, cursed things, to the ground, where thus I take vengeance upon you! (?) Because ye have been my ruin, die ye too, so as ye may.

But see, Apollo himself, stripping from me the prophet's vesture! He hath had the spectacle of me exposed, even in and along with this sacred garb, to the derision of friend and foe alike, and in vain—yes, 'mountebank, beggar, starveling' were the names, alas, that vagabond-like I had to bear: and now the Seer hath finished my seership, and brought me to die like this, where there awaits me not the altar of my home, but a

---

v. 1644, the adverbial preposition is emphasized by separation. So long as Cassandra was mocked, Apollo cared not if the sacred emblems of his own religion were exposed to indignity 'along with' her. **μετά** here means *οὐκ ἄνευ τούτων* as *σύν* in *v.* 591 means *μὴ ἄνευ τῶν ἄλλων*.—*μέγα* Hermann.

1271. **φίλων...διχορρόπως** *by friends and foes indifferently* disbelieved, that is, in Argos just as formerly in Troy (Hermann, Peile, Conington etc.). The absence of a copula between *φίλων* and *ἐχθρῶν* depends on the same principle of antithesis as *ἄνω κάτω* *up and down*, *ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν* Soph. *Ant.* 1079, *δάκνειν δάκνεσθαι* Aristoph. *Frogs* 861 (Kühner, § 546, 5, *ε*, d).—Others join *φίλων*, as an adjective, to *ἐχθρῶν*, or *vice versa*, or take together *μετὰ* and *φίλων* 'by foes with (*as well as*) friends'. In favour of this last see Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XIV. 117, citing somewhat similar uses of *σὺν ἐχθροῖς καὶ φίλοις*, in which however *σύν* does not seem to mean *as well as* but simply *with*.—**μάτην**. As the prophecies were still disbelieved, the mockery was borne in vain.—The pause after *διχορρόπως* gives sharp emphasis to the final word.

1273. **τάλαινα** *Alas!*—'Like a vagabond, I endured beggary, wretchedness, hunger', T. C. Snow, *Class. Rev.* II. 319, supposing an actual wandering: but *καλουμένη* is a difficulty.

1274. **καὶ νῦν** resumes the main sentence. As he has followed with revengeful delight her sufferings as prophetess, so *now also* he has come to witness the last penalty.—**μάντιν ἐκπράξας ἐμέ** 'having finished my seership', 'having done with me as a seer'. *Finished* here is not quite the same thing as *destroyed* (Soph. *O. C.* 1659); Cassandra the *μάντις* is 'finished', as having completed her punishment so far as it was to be inflicted through the prophetic gift. In sign of which the god by her own hands has stripped off the fatal emblems.

1276—1277. **κοπείσης**, possessive, depending on *ἐπίξηνον*, literally 'the block of one struck', 'the victim's block'. That *κοπεῖσα* is strictly general in sense explains the use of the timeless aorist.

θερμῷ κοπείσης φοινίῳ προσφάγματι.
οὐ μὴν ἄτιμοί γ' ἐκ θεῶν τεθνήξομεν.
ἥξει γὰρ ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμάορος,
μητροκτόνον φίτυμα, ποινάτωρ πατρός·
φυγὰς δ' ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος
κάτεισιν ἄτας τάσδε θριγκώσων φίλοις·
ἄξει νιν ὑπτίασμα κειμένου πατρός.
τί δῆτ' ἐγὼ κάτοικος ὧδ' ἀναστένω;
ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον εἶδον Ἰλίου πόλιν
πράξασαν ὡς ἔπραξεν, οἳ δ' εἶχον πόλιν
οὕτως ἀπαλλάσσουσιν ἐκ θεῶν κρίσει,
ἰοῦσα πράξω, τλήσομαι τὸ κατθανεῖν·
ὀμώμοται γὰρ ὅρκος ἐκ θεῶν μέγας.
Ἅιδου πύλας δὲ τάσδ' ἐγὼ προσεννέπω,

1278. *ἄτιμόν* (corr. to *ἄτιμοι*). 1283. *ἄξειν νυν*. 1290. *τὰς λέγω*.

θερμῷ is a predicate to **φοινίῳ προσφάγματι**, *quasi τῷ φοινίῳ προσφάγματι*. Literally 'upon the before-shed (or first-shed) blood being warm'. The dative is that which, on the analogy of the genitive, is sometimes called 'absolute'. The **πρόσφαγμα** is the blood of Agamemnon. See further Appendix Z.

1278. **τεθνήξομεν** *we*, strictly plural, Cassandra *and Agamemnon*.

1283. **ἄξει νιν** g, h. Hermann retaining *ἄξειν* (f) inserts here *v.* 1289, but see note there.—Of **ὑπτίασμα** only a conjectural explanation can be given. It means literally 'the turning of a thing upside down'. Thus the position of the hands in prayer with the palms upwards is *ὑπτίασμα χειρῶν*. Here it refers to the overthrow of the fallen (*κειμένου*) Agamemnon. But it can scarcely be supposed that the poet, without special reason, would describe so simple a matter by such a far-fetched and unnatural word, or that *ὑπτίασμα κειμένου πατρός* is merely an equivalent for *κείμενος πατήρ*. As this verse is in form a commentary on the preceding, it is there we should look for the explanation. The only expression likely to suggest remark is *θριγκώσων*. With this metaphor therefore *ὑπτίασμα* should be connected; the *ὑπτίασμα* of Agamemnon's fall will bring or lead to the *θριγκός* of Orestes' vengeance. The *θριγκός* was the finish of a piece of building, such as the coping stone of a wall, the *abacus* of a capital, etc.: and *ὑπτίασμα* therefore, to suit the metaphor, should be what comes before, *i.e.* below, the *θριγκός*. In all building, unless on a very small scale, the projection of the *θριγκός* is secured and connected with the vertical *by an inward slope*; and this slope is effected by a stone or piece which is a *ὑπτίασμα* in the proper sense, having a larger end and a smaller, and standing upon the smaller, *i.e.* upside down. More particularly in the capital of a pillar, the inward-sloping part (in Doric architecture the *echinus*), which carries the *abacus* or flat top, is a *ὑπτίασμα*. We may conjecture therefore that to this part of a wall or column was applied the term *ὑπτίασμα*, or some term (*e.g.* *τὸ ὕπτιον*) suggesting this. For

butcherly block for a victim struck before the last blood is cold.

Yet not unregarded of heaven shall we die. For there shall come another yet to requite for us, one born to slay his mother, to avenge his sire. Exiled from this land, a wanderer disowned, he shall return, to put on this tower of unnatural crimes that pinnacle, whereto his father's death is the leading spire.

I am come to my 'home', and why thus wail? Since I saw first Ilium meet the fate it hath, and now they, who were her captors, are brought by the gods of their choice to their present pass, I will go meet fate, will take death patiently, because the gods with a mighty oath have sworn it!

Only I greet this door as the portal of Death, and my prayer

---

the same architectural metaphor with the same application see *v.* 1339.

1284. **κάτοικος** means 'one who settles' or takes up his abode in a place. In bitter irony she identifies herself as she has been bidden to do (*v.* 1020) with the house of Agamemnon, and chides herself for delaying to enter where she is to abide.—*κάτοικτος* Scaliger.

1286. **εἶχον.** The imperfect tense is used in contrast to the succeeding present *ἀπαλλάσσουσιν*: cf. *v.* 709 *ὑμέναιον ὃς τότ' ἐπέρρεπεν γαμβροῖσιν ἀείδειν*. **οἳ δ' εἶχον** is literally 'those who (then) were the takers (of the town)'. As *σχεῖν* is *to take*, so *ἔχειν* is *to be taking*, as in *v.* 670.—**πάλιν** Keck, for **πόλιν**, *i.e. on the contrary* or *in their turn*. The object to *εἶχον* (*αὐτήν*) would naturally be supplied, and *πάλιν* improves the point.

1287. 'Are brought by their *choice of gods* to their present pass', literally 'are coming off thus by choice of gods'. **ἐκ θεῶν**, *out of* or *among gods*, depends upon **κρίσει** (*choosing*, from *κρίνω choose*); cf. *v.* 1365, *Theb.* 806 *ὑπ' ἀλλήλων φόνῳ* etc. —**ἐν θεῶν κρίσει** (g, h) is perhaps only a conjecture to simplify the construction, but the meaning is not altered.—The thought is this: from the triumph of Agamemnon and the Greeks it might have appeared, and it was argued, that the Trojans had chosen their patrons ill, and in particular that they erred in adopting the *κρίσις*, *the judgment* or *choice*, of Paris: but now it seems that Zeus Xenios (*vv.* 374, 705 etc.), Hera, and the other vaunted patrons of the Greeks, have no mind to protect the victors. Evil destiny therefore is omnipotent, and nothing remains but to submit to it.—*ἐν θεῶν κρίσει* may also be rendered 'under the decision of the gods'.

1288. **ἰοῦσα πράξω** 'I will go to my own fate (*faring*)'. The sense of *πράξω* is explained (Paley) by *πράξασαν* in *v.* 1286 to which it refers.—**τλήσομαι τὸ κατθανεῖν** defines *πράξω*. The abrupt asyndeton is intentional for effect.

1289. *For have not the gods sworn a mighty oath? i.e.* what I am to suffer is *fated*, as was the destruction of Troy, as is the impending death of Agamemnon, as is the future vengeance of Orestes. The divine oath, the Homeric symbol of certain destiny, is used here with a general application, summing up the fatalistic argument of the passage.—Hermann places this verse before *v.* 1283.

1290. 'But in *my* salutation this gate shall be the gate of *Death*'. She contrasts her conscious going-in to death with the confident salutation of Agamemnon, *θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους δίκη προσειπεῖν* (*v.* 801), and again *ἐς μέλαθρα ἐλθὼν θεοῖσι δεξιώσομαι* (*v.* 843). The parallel is in-

ἐπεύχομαι δὲ καιρίας πληγῆς τυχεῖν,
ὡς ἀσφάδαστος, αἱμάτων εὐθνησίμων
ἀπορρυέντων, ὄμμα συμβάλω τόδε.
ΧΟ. ὦ πολλὰ μὲν τάλαινα, πολλὰ δὲ †σοφὴ
γύναι, μακρὰν ἔτεινας· εἰ δ' ἐτητύμως
μόρον τὸν αὑτῆς οἶσθα, πῶς θεηλάτου
βοὸς δίκην πρὸς βωμὸν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς;
ΚΑ. οὐκ ἔστ' ἄλυξις, οὔ, ξένοι, χρόνῳ πλέῳ.
ΧΟ. ὁ δ' ὕστατός γε τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεύεται.
ΚΑ. ἥκει τόδ' ἦμαρ· σμικρὰ κερδανῶ φυγῇ.
ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ἴσθι τλήμων οὖσ' ἀπ' εὐτόλμου φρενός.
ΚΑ. οὐδεὶς ἀκούει ταῦτα τῶν εὐδαιμόνων.
ΧΟ. ἀλλ' εὐκλεῶς τοι κατθανεῖν χάρις βροτῷ.
ΚΑ. ἰὼ πάτερ σοῦ τῶν τε γενναίων τέκνων.
ΧΟ. τί δ' ἐστὶ χρῆμα, τίς σ' ἀποστρέφει φόβος;
ΚΑ. φεῦ φεῦ.
ΧΟ. τί τοῦτ' ἔφευξας; εἴ τι μὴ φρενῶν στύγος.
ΚΑ. φόβον δόμοι πνέουσιν αἱματοσταγῆ.
ΧΟ. καὶ πῶς; τόδ' ὄζει θυμάτων ἐφεστίων.
ΚΑ. ὅμοιος ἀτμὸς ὥσπερ ἐκ τάφου πρέπει.

1298. πλέῳ.

---

troduced by *κάτοικος* in *v.* 1284 and guides the whole passage.—**τάσδ' ἐγώ** Auratus.

1294. Read perhaps **σχεθρὰ**: *very miserable, but very patient* (see the following lines). *σχεδρός* or *σχεθρός* is given by Hesychius, with the interpretation *τλήμων patient*, which this passage (see *v.* 1301) suggests. For the derivation from *σχεῖν to bear*, cf. *ἀνασχετός*.—**δ' αὖ** *Cod. Farn.* with **σοφή**, which, if retained, should be understood, as the context indicates, ironically. But it may be an explanation of *σχεθρά*, arising from the confusion of *σχεθρός* and *σκεθρός*.

1295. 'You have by long speaking deferred your fate for some time, it is true, but if you really foresee it, why go to it at all?' This is the tone.

1296. **θεηλάτου**. If a victim came to the place of sacrifice willingly, it was supposed to indicate the divine choice.

1297. **εὐτόλμως** literally 'with easy courage', *carelessly* rather than *bravely*. See on Eur. *Med.* 496.

1298. **χρόνῳ πλέῳ.** *When the time is full, there is no escape.* For the dative see Appendix Z. Here it may be quasi-causal, *by fulness of time there is no escape*, or quasi-possessive, *a full time hath no escape*, the *χρόνος* being personified as in *v.* 885; see the note cited, and particularly Theocr. 13. 29. But it is unnecessary to decide the exact relation, as the case like the genitive signifies merely accompanying circumstance. —**χρόνοι πλέῳ** (Weil) *the times are full*, a separate clause.

is to receive a mortal stroke, that the blood-stream may flow easy, and I may not struggle but close mine eyes.

Eld. O woman patient as miserable! When all this is spoken, yet now, if verily thou dost know thine own death, why goest thou to it, enduring as the ox, which the god moves toward the altar?

Cass. There is no escape, friends, none, when the time is full.

Eld. Yea, but the last of the time is best.

Cass. The day is come. Little shall I gain by flight.

Eld. Then be assured, that thou hast a stubborn patience!

Cass. So praised is never any save the unhappy.

Eld. Yet a mortal may be glad to die with honour.

Cass. Ah father, to think of thee and those, thy genuine children!...

Eld. What is it? What horror turns thee back?

Cass. O foul, O foul!

Eld. What callest thou foul, if the loathing be not in thy fancy?

Cass. 'Tis the horror of dripping blood, that the house exhales.

Eld. Nay, nay: it is the scent of the hearth-sacrifice.

Cass. It is such a reek as might come out of a grave.

1299. Two constructions are possible: (1) **τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεύεται** *he that is last* (to undergo the inevitable) *has the advantage in respect of time*; Hermann, Paley and others: and (2) **ὁ ὕστατος τοῦ χρόνου** *the last of the time is best*, Elberling cited by Hermann. (2) seems preferable, since (1) introduces a comparison of different persons, which is scarcely to the point. Either way the meaning is that an inevitable evil may at least be put off to the last.—**τοῦ χρόνου**: '*the* time' of the preceding verse.

1301—1303. They attempt to console her with praise, but she answers with sad resignation. Although impressed they are determined not to be convinced (see *v.* 1305), and their consolation is but half serious.—Against the rearrangement of this passage by Heath and Hermann (thus, 1301, 1303, 1302) see Paley, Sidgwick, Kennedy, Conington. To Cassandra the sentiment ἀλλ' εὐκλεῶς κτλ. is not suitable.

1304. With this cry of misery and repentance, suggested partly by *εὐκλεῶς κατθανεῖν*, she moves to enter, but starts back in an agony of physical horror.—**τῶν**. Degraded as she is, she does not count herself among *τὰ γενναῖα τῶν τέκνων*. There is no *εὐκλεῶς κατθανεῖν* for her.—*σῶν* Auratus.

1308. **φόβον** of that which terrifies, as in *v.* 1305 and *Theb.* 487. See Tennyson, *Maud* I. I. I 'The red-ribb'd ledges *drip with a silent horror of blood*'. With *φόβον πνέουσιν* cf. *κλάζουσι φόβον* *Theb.* 373.—*φόνον Cod. Farn.*

ΧΟ. οὐ Σύριον ἀγλάισμα δώμασιν λέγεις.
ΚΑ. ἀλλ' εἶμι κἀν δόμοισι κωκύσουσ' ἐμὴν
Ἀγαμέμνονός τε μοῖραν. ἀρκείτω βίος.
ἰὼ ξένοι.
οὔτοι δυσοίζω θάμνον ὡς ὄρνις φόβῳ
ἄλλως· θανούσῃ μαρτυρεῖτέ μοι τόδε,
ὅταν γυνὴ γυναικὸς ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θάνῃ,
ἀνήρ τε δυσδάμαρτος ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς πέσῃ.
ἐπιξενοῦμαι, ταῦτα δ' ὡς θανουμένη.
ΧΟ. ὦ τλῆμον, οἰκτείρω σε θεσφάτου μόρου.
ΚΑ. ἅπαξ ἔτ' εἰπεῖν ῥῆσιν—ἢ θρῆνον θέλω
ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς; ἡλίῳ δ' ἐπεύχομαι,
πρὸς ὕστατον φῶς, τοῖς ἐμοῖς τιμαόροις
ἐχθροὺς φόνευσιν τοὺς ἐμοὺς τίνειν ὁμοῦ
δούλης θανούσης εὐμαροῦς χειρώματος.
ἰὼ βρότεια πράγματ'· εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν
σκιά τις ἂν τρέψειεν· εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ,
βολαῖς ὑγρώσσων σπόγγος ὤλεσεν γραφήν.
καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκείνων μᾶλλον οἰκτείρω πολύ.
ΧΟ. τὸ μὲν εὖ πράσσειν ἀκόρεστον ἔφυ
πᾶσι βροτοῖσιν· δακτυλοδείκτων δ'

1316. ἀλλ' ὡς. 1324. *ἐχθροῖς φονεῦσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς* (originally *τους*). 1327. *ἀντρέψειεν.*

1314. She turns back again.

1316. **ἄλλως· θανούσῃ** Hermann.

1319. *I.e.* 'if I make a claim upon you as my new *ξένοι*, it is my first and my last', literally 'I claim *ξενία*, but *that* as one about to die': cf. *καὶ ταῦτα* 'and that', and see *v.* 556.—The verse may also be taken as one clause, with the same sense.

1320. This is the only speaker who expresses full conviction and sympathy, and the one touch of relief to the horror of the scene. One *ξένος* responds to her last appeal, and with that she turns from them for ever.

1321. *I would speak one speech more, or is it mine own dirge?* She has spoken *ὡς θανουμένη* (*v.* 1391), yet she will speak once more, if it be but *ὡς θανοῦσα*. It is the last stage in the conflict between her terror and her despair.—*ῥῆσιν, οὐ θρῆνον* (Hermann).

1322—1325. The sense is 'I make to the sun my last prayer, that when revenge comes, *my* wrongs may not be forgotten'. In the words there is some error, and many corrections (see Wecklein) are more or less plausible.—**ἐχθροὺς...τοὺς ἐμοὺς** Pearson; **φόνευσιν** Bothe, cf. *φονεύω*, *φόνευμα*: 'that *my* enemies may simul-

Eld. Thou canst not mean the sweet incense of the palace.

Cass. Yet I will go, and within, as here, will wail the fate of me and of Agamemnon. Enough of life!

Oh friends, my friends!

I do not clamour for naught as a bird that dreads a bush. Bear this witness to me dead, when some day for my death another woman shall die, and for the hapless husband another fall. This office I ask of you at the point to die.

Eld. Ah miserable, I pity thee for thy death foretold!

Cass. I would speak one speech more—or is it mine own dirge? To the sun I call, unto the last I see, that those my avengers may take of these my enemies a bloody vengeance also for the easy conquest of a poor slain slave.

Alas for the state of man! If happiness may be changed as it were by a shade, misery is a picture which at the dash of the wet sponge is gone. And this I say is the more pitiable by far.

[*Exit.*

The Elders. Prosperity in all men doth naturally crave more. Though the palace be pointed at by jealous fingers,

---

taneously pay to *my* avengers the slaying of a slave'. Between **τοῖς ἐμοῖς** and **ὁμοῦ** (*at the same time* with the vengeance for Agamemnon) there is no doubt a logical inconsistency: logic would require *τοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως τιμαόροις* or the like. But what is lost in logic is perhaps gained in effect: she says once too often that which she wants to say, that the wrong is *hers* also, the avengers *hers* also.—Mr Housman, *Journal of Philology* XVI. p. 287, proposes *τοῖς νέοις*.—**ἡλίῳ,...πρὸς ὕστατον φῶς** are cumulative, one repeating the other.

1326—1329. In **ἂν τρέψειεν** (Porson) *τρέπω* has the sense analogous to *τροπή change*.—**ταῦτα** *the latter*, the destruction of the miserable, **ἐκείνων** *the former*, that of the prosperous.—She is still protesting against neglect of her part in the injury. The murder of the poor slave may count for little beside the murder of the great king; and vulgar opinion may esteem the overthrow of prosperity a more tragic thing than the extinction of misery which is only just on this side of nothing. But *this*, not *that*, is truly the more pitiable case.—*σκιᾷ τις ἂν πρέψειεν* (*one may liken them to a sketch*) Conington, from Photius *πρέψαι· ὁμοιῶσαι*. But is this gloss likely to be right? *πρέψας· εἰκασμένος, εἰκασθείς* (Hesychius) is no doubt correct, but does not support the other. —*σκιάν ... γράψειεν* Rauchenstein, *σκιᾷ ...γράψειεν* H. Richards (*Class. Rev.* VII. 19).—**δυστυχῇ** Victorius, **δυστυχοῖ** Blomfield. Either is possible in poetry. But **δυστυχῇ** is also possible and expresses the point better; the conditional sentence is then elliptical, the verb (*τρέψειεν* or something of the same general sense) being supplied from the preceding *τρέψειεν*. The change, which to prosperity is an overshadowing, is to misery obliteration. Whichever be read, the meaning is practically the same.

1333. **μηκέτ' ἐσέλθῃς** Hermann. The verse has been wrongly completed to a full dimeter.

οὔτις ἀπειπὼν εἴργει μελάθρων,
μηκέτ' ἐσέλθῃς, τάδε φωνῶν.
καὶ τῷδε πόλιν μὲν ἑλεῖν ἔδοσαν
μάκαρες Πριάμου,
θεοτίμητος δ' οἴκαδ' ἱκάνει·
νῦν δ' εἰ προτέρων αἷμ' ἀποτίσει
καὶ τοῖσι θανοῦσι θανὼν ἄλλων
ποινὰς θανάτων ἐπικρανεῖ,
τίς τίν' ἂν εὔξαιτο βροτῶν ἀσινεῖ
δαίμονι φῦναι τάδ' ἀκούων;

ΑΓ. ὤμοι, πέπληγμαι καιρίαν πληγὴν ἔσω.
ΧΟ. σῖγα· τίς πληγὴν ἀυτεῖ καιρίως οὐτασμένος;
ΑΓ. ὤμοι μάλ' αὖθις, δευτέραν πεπληγμένος.
ΧΟ. τοὔργον εἰργάσθαι δοκεῖ μοι βασιλέως οἰμώγμασιν.
ἀλλὰ κοινωσώμεθ' ἄν πως ἀσφαλῆ βουλεύματα.
1. ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην λέγω,
πρὸς δῶμα δεῦρ' ἀστοῖσι κηρύσσειν βοήν.
2. ἐμοὶ δ' ὅπως τάχιστά γ' ἐμπεσεῖν δοκεῖ
καὶ πρᾶγμ' ἐλέγχειν σὺν νεορρύτῳ ξίφει.

1333. *μηκέτι δ' εἰσέλθῃς.* 1340. *τίς ἄν.*

1338. **τοῖσι θανοῦσι θανὼν** *adding death to deaths.* With the dative cf. Soph. *O. T.* 175 ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλῳ προσίδοις ὅρμενον *life on life mayst thou see speed,* where "the dative seems to depend mainly on the notion of adding implied by the iteration itself" (Jebb). Here it is helped by ἐπί in the verb. See also on *Theb.* 424 κέρδει κέρδος ἄλλο τίκτεται.

ib. **ἄλλων...ἐπικρανεῖ** *must crown the pile with yet other deaths in revenge,* literally 'is putting other revengeful deaths as a capital upon the column', referring to *v.* 1283, where the same metaphor is applied to the same facts.—**ἐπικρανεῖ** should perhaps be corrected to **ἐπικραίνει.** If right (as it may be) it is the present of ἐπικρᾱνέω, a verb formed from ἐπίκρᾱνον the *capital* of a column (and from the stem κρᾱν- *head,* whence κράνιον *skull* etc.), as ἐπιτελέω from τέλος. The present tense is used, as often in prophecy (Kühner, *Gr. Gramm.* § 382, 5 and 6), of that which is on the way to be done.

1340. **τίς τίν' ἂν εὔξαιτο...;** a double interrogative, *who could affirm that any mortal...?*—τίς, τίς Musgrave.

1342. **καιρίαν** *mortal.* On the history of this word, which, though formed from καιρός, seems to have been influenced in use by a resemblance to κήριος from κήρ, see Leaf on Hom. *Il.* 4. 185.

none forbidding shuts fortune out with these words 'Enter no more'.

And so to the king the gods have given to take the town of Priam, and he comes honoured of heaven to his home: yet now if he must pay for the blood of those before, if adding death to deaths he is to crown the pile with yet other deaths in revenge, who hearing this could affirm that any mortal is born with fortune beyond harm?

Agamemnon (*within*). Oh, I am struck, deep-struck and mortally!

Eld. Silence! Who shrieks as wounded with a mortal stroke?

Ag. Again, oh again! Another stroke!

Eld. The deed, I doubt, is done, from the cries of the king. But let us give each other safe counsel, if we may.

The Elders in succession.

1. I give you mine own judgment, that we summon a rescue of the folk to the palace.

2. Nay, I think we had best dash in at once, and prove the deed by the dripping sword.

1346. **κοινωσώμεθ' ἄν πως κτλ**: *i.e.*, to render the full force, 'we will, *if we may*, give to one another safe counsel'.—ἄν with the imperatival subjunctive is contrary to rule, and generally rejected. But if we may reason from analogy, such a use should occur occasionally. It exists in Homer with κεν, as the expression of a conditional purpose (Monro, *Hom. Grammar* § 275), and may be supposed to have disappeared gradually, being retained meanwhile in poetry like other archaic syntax. The effect of ἄν would be to give a *tentative* tone, suggesting subjection to the condition of possibility. This is the account usually given of final ὡς with ἄν and without, and it appears to be correct, so far as any difference is strictly observed. We can understand why in the imperative the like variation should be extremely rare. Between the *tentative* and the *imperative* there is a natural inconsistency. But here it would be not out of place.—The proposed corrections, ἔμπας, ἥν πως, ἄν πως etc., are not satisfactory.

1347. On the distribution of these speeches see Wecklein. The text points, as observed by Bamberger and O. Müller, to a chorus of 12 elders, and this is probably the intention, although a tradition (schol. to Aristoph. *Knights* 589) gives to this play the larger tragic chorus of 15.—On the scene in general at this point see the Introduction.

1348. **βοήν** *i.e.* *βοήθειαν*: *to cry a rescue.*

3. κἀγὼ τοιούτου γνώματος κοινωνὸς ὢν
ψηφίζομαί τι δρᾶν· τὸ μὴ μέλλειν δ' ἀκμή.
4. ὁρᾶν πάρεστι· φροιμιάζονται γὰρ ὡς
τυραννίδος σημεῖα πράσσοντες πόλει.
5. χρονίζομεν γάρ· οἱ δὲ μελλούσης κλέος
πέδοι πατοῦντες οὐ καθεύδουσιν χερί.
6. οὐκ οἶδα βουλῆς ἧστινος τυχὼν λέγω.
τοῦ δρῶντός ἐστι καὶ τὸ βουλεῦσαι πέρι.
7. κἀγὼ τοιοῦτός εἰμ', ἐπεὶ δυσμηχανῶ
λόγοισι τὸν θανόντ' ἀνιστάναι πάλιν.
8. ἦ καὶ βίον κτείνοντες ὧδ' ὑπείξομεν
δόμων καταισχυντῆρσι τοῖσδ' ἡγουμένοις;
9. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνεκτόν, ἀλλὰ κατθανεῖν κρατεῖ·
πεπαιτέρα γὰρ μοῖρα τῆς τυραννίδος.
10. ἦ γὰρ τεκμηρίοισιν ἐξ οἰμωγμάτων
μαντευσόμεσθα τἀνδρὸς ὡς ὀλωλότος;
11. σάφ' εἰδότας χρὴ τῶνδε μυθοῦσθαι πέρι·
τὸ γὰρ τοπάζειν τοῦ σάφ' εἰδέναι δίχα.
12. ταύτην ἐπαινεῖν πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι,
τρανῶς Ἀτρείδην εἰδέναι κυροῦνθ' ὅπως.

ΚΛ. πολλῶν πάροιθεν καιρίως εἰρημένων

1355. *τῆς μελλούσης.* 1356. *πέδον.*

1355. **μελλούσης**: supply from the previous line *αὐτῆς, i.e. τῆς πόλεως*, the *city* or *citizens*. 'From the way they begin', says the last speaker, 'it would seem they mean to enslave the city'. 'Because we delay', answers this one impatiently. 'They, while she hesitates, trample her glory down and work unresting!' The *πόλις*, as he conceives, is represented by themselves.—Various ancient writers (among them Trypho, of the time of Augustus, *περὶ τρόπων* III. p. 196), cite, as an Aeschylean example of *μελλώ delay*, *χρονίζομεν ὧδε τῆς μελλοῦς χάριν*. If this refers to our passage, it points to **τῆς μελλοῦς** (Hermann). *μελλώ* will then be a personification for *οἱ μέλλοντες*, *while they, trampling on the glory of Delay, i.e.* 'of those who delay'. It may be suspected however that *τῆς μελλοῦς* is no more than a conjecture upon a text exhibiting, as ours does, *τῆς μελλούσης*, where *τῆς* may be a note, indicating that a prose-writer would have used the article.—*οἱ δέ, μελλούσης, Cod. Farn.* explaining *μελλούσης* by *τῆς τυραννίδος δηλονότι*. See further Prof. Tucker, *Class. Rev.* VII. 342, who strengthens

3. And I too am with this judgment so far, that my vote is for act. It is no moment for delay.

4. There is occasion to beware. Their beginning betokens a plan to enslave the state.

5. Yes, because we linger! They, while she hesitates, tread her honour down and work unresting.

6. I know not what advice I may find to say. To a doer it belongs to advise about the doing.

7. I too am of like mind, for I see not how with words to raise up again the dead.

8. Are we to make death of life, thus yielding to the rule of those that have defiled a house?

9. Nay, 'tis intolerable, nay, death is better. It is a milder fate than to be enslaved.

10. Are we then indeed by inference from a cry to divine that the prince hath perished?

11. Best know the facts before we hear one another talk. Guessing and knowing are two things.

12. All sides support me in assenting to this, to have clear knowledge how it is with Atreus' son.

Clytaemnestra. If now I contradict all that to suit the

(at all events) the case against τῆς μελλοῦς κλέος.—**πέδοι** Hermann.

1358. *To the doer (of a thing) it belongs to make plans about it, i.e.* it is of no use making suggestions where no execution is to follow. The speaker is helpless, the next even more so.—See however Prof. Tucker, *Class. Rev.* VII. 341.

1361. **βίον κτείνοντες** *slaying our life, i.e.* accepting a condition no better than death. Compare the common phrase οὐ βιώσιμον for an intolerable state. This explanation is offered by the *Cod. Farn.*, nor does it seem to me impossible.—**βίον τείνοντες** (Canter).

1365. **τεκμηρίοισιν ἐξ οἰμωγμάτων.** See *vv.* 804, 1288, 1412, 1630, *Theb.* 1015 ἐκφορὰ φίλων ὕπο, etc.

1367. **θυμοῦσθαι** (E. Ahrens, Hermann) *We had best know the facts before we indulge anger.*—**μυθοῦσθαι**: literally 'to be-talk one another' (the *mutual* use of the passive voice) formed from μῦθος in its depreciatory sense (*talk, mere words*), *We had best know the facts before we hear one another talk.* The verb μυθόω is not extant elsewhere, but the analogy of πισσόω, χρυσόω, 'to be-pitch, be-gold' etc., is quite as close as is required, when a word is invented to make a point. In such a case the strangeness of the formation is its merit.

1369. **ταύτην** (τὴν γνώμην) see *v.* 1347.—**πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι** lit. *I am multiplied from all sides, i.e. From all sides I find support* to approve this vote. Somewhat similar is the use in *Supp.* 612 δήμου κρατοῦσα χεὶρ ὅπῃ πληθύνεται (Sidgwick). The previous speaker is received with general signs of approval.

1371. See the Introduction.

τἀναντί' εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι.
πῶς γάρ τις ἐχθροῖς ἐχθρὰ πορσύνων; φίλοις
δοκοῦσιν εἶναι πημονὴν ἀρκύστατον
φράξειεν ὕψος κρεῖσσον ἐκπηδήματος.
ἐμοὶ δ' ἀγὼν ὅδ' οὐκ ἀφρόντιστος πάλαι
νίκης παλαιᾶς ἦλθε, σὺν χρόνῳ γε μήν·
ἕστηκα δ' ἔνθ' ἔπαισ' ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις.
οὕτω δ' ἔπραξα καὶ τάδ' (οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι)
ὡς μήτε φεύγειν μήτ' ἀμύνασθαι μόρον,
ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον, ὥσπερ ἰχθύων
περιστιχίζων, πλοῦτον εἵματος κακόν.
παίω δέ νιν δίς· κἀν δυοῖν οἰμώγμασιν
μεθῆκεν αὑτοῦ κῶλα· καὶ πεπτωκότι
τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι, τοῦ κατὰ χθονός,
Ἅιδου νεκρῶν σωτῆρος, εὐκταίαν χάριν.
οὕτω τὸν αὑτοῦ θυμὸν ὁρμαίνει πεσών·
κἀκφυσιῶν ὀξεῖαν αἵματος σφαγὴν
βάλλει μ' ἐρεμνῇ ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου,
χαίρουσαν οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἢ διοσδότῳ
γάνει σπορητὸς κάλυκος ἐν λοχεύμασιν.

1382. περιστοιχίζων. 1390. διὸς νότω γᾶν εἰ.

1373—1375. *How should one* [*be ashamed of serviceable falsehood*], *who plots hostility against a foe? i.e.* 'All is fair in war'.—**πῶς γάρ τις** ἐπαισχυνθήσεται κτλ., supplied from the previous sentence. For examples see L. and Sc. *s.v.* πῶς, III.—**ἐχθρὰ πορσύνων**, literally 'contriving hostility'.—**φίλοις ... εἶναι**: 'with what pretends to be friendship', instrumental neuter, antithetic to ἐχθρά *hostility*, not to ἐχθροῖς.—**πημονὴν ἀρκύστατον** (adjective), literally 'mischief set as a snare'.—**φράξειεν**: the optative *imperative*, as in *v.* 936 and *v.* 557 where, as here, it is joined with τις.—**ὕψος** accusative, defining the extent of the action φράσσειν.—These verses are commonly punctuated as one sentence and variously corrected. With πημονῆς (Auratus) and ἀρκύστατ' ἂν (Elmsley) they are rendered, 'for how else (than by deceit) could one, devising ill for foes who seem friends, fence the snares of woe too high to leap over?' But the 'semblance' or 'pretence' of friendship on the part of the assailed has nothing to do with the situation. What is to be excused is the pretence of friendship on the part of the assailant. This will apply to any explanation which makes φίλοις masculine.

1376. **ἀγὼν...νίκης** *struggle for victory*: ἀγών in its proper *agonistic* sense, a contest in the games.—**πάλαι...παλαιᾶς**: a sort of assonance or play, in the use of which Aeschylus resembles Shakespeare,

moment I said before, I shall feel no shame. What shame should he feel, who plots as a foe against a foe? With the semblance of friendship let him make his dangerous snare too high to be overleaped.

For me, I have had long enough to prepare this wrestle for victory, though it has come at last. I stand where I struck, over the finished work. Even the slaying I wrought (I own it) so as to forbid escape or resistance to the death, a net unpassable, like the fisherman's round a shoal, a rich robe deadly dyed. Twice I smote him, and with two shrieks he there sank down. And when he had fallen, I gave him yet a third stroke, an offering of thanks to the nether god, to Hades, safe keeper of the dead. With that he lay, and himself gasped away his breath. And as he blew the spurts of his running blood, he rained upon me a crimson gory dew; and I rejoiced no less than beneath the sweet rain of heaven doth the corn when it bursts from the labouring sheath.

---

on the two possible senses of *παλαιός*, *ancient* from *πάλαι*, and *in wrestling* from *πάλη*. See *Cho.* 865 *τοιάνδε πάλην μόνος ὢν ἔφεδρος δισσοῖς μέλλει...'Ορέστης ἅψειν· εἴη δ' ἐπὶ νίκῃ*, where *ἔφεδρος*, meaning 'a third champion who waits to contend with the victor in a preliminary contest', implies that the victory of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra was itself a *νίκη παλαιά*, and is in fact an allusion to this passage. The metaphor of the *πάλη* leads up to the picture in *v.* 1378. On the Aeschylean use of equivocation in general see Appendix II. to the *Seven Against Thebes* and the Indices to that play, this and the *Choephori*, under *Verbal Equivocation*.—*νείκης* Heath, a supposed equivalent of *νείκους*, *this fighting out of an old quarrel*. The form *νείκη* for *νεῖκος* is not very well attested (see Blomfield *ad loc.* and Eur. *Or.* 1679), and in any case is not requisite here.

1379. **καὶ τάδ'** *this also*. Even the very blow, like the rest (*v.* 1376) had been carefully thought out. This punctuation (Headlam) is preferable to joining *καὶ...ἀρνήσομαι*.

1380. **μόρον** *death* here signifies the means or instrument of death, as in *Cho.* 1072 *σωτήρ, ἢ μόρον εἴπω; Theb.* 736 *ἐγείνατο μόρον αὐτῷ*, *inf.* 1495 *δολίῳ μόρῳ δαμείς* etc. See also the uses of *ἄτη*.—**ἀμφίβληστρον** in apposition to *μόρον*.—**ὥσπερ...περιστιχίζων** (g), literally 'as one that sets (his net) about fish': the object of *περιστιχίζων* is supplied from *ἀμφίβληστρον*.—**πλοῦτον εἵματος**: see on *v.* 949, *v.* 1101.

1384. **αὐτοῦ** 'then and there' *illico* (Hermann).—*αὑτοῦ* Voss.

1385. The third blow is compared to the third libation usually poured to *Σωτήρ* or *Ζεὺς Σωτήρ* (see *v.* 257), with an ambiguity in *σωτήρ*. Hades, the god of the lower world, is 'the *σωτήρ* of the dead', in the sense that he 'keeps them safely'.—**τοῦ κατὰ χθονός**, 'the subterranean power', is a separate substantive, to which *Ἅιδου νεκρῶν σωτῆρος* is added as an explanation.

1387. **ὁρμαίνει** *sped*, with the secondary suggestion of *panted forth* (see on *Theb.* 381).—*ὀρυγάνει* Hermann (from Hesych. *ὀρυγάνει· ἐρεύγεται*), *belched*.

1390. **διοσδότῳ γάνει** Porson.

ὡς ὧδ' ἐχόντων, πρέσβος Ἀργείων τόδε,
χαίροιτ' ἄν, εἰ χαίροιτ', ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεύχομαι.
εἰ δ' ἦν πρεπόντων ὥστ' ἐπισπένδειν νεκρῷ,
τάδ' ἂν δικαίως ἦν, ὑπερδίκως μὲν οὖν.
τοσῶνδε κρατῆρ' ἐν δόμοις κακῶν ὅδε
πλήσας ἀραίων αὐτὸς ἐκπίνει μολών.

ΧΟ. θαυμάζομέν σου γλῶσσαν, ὡς θρασύστομος,
ἥτις τοιόνδ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ κομπάζεις λόγον.

ΚΛ. πειρᾶσθέ μου γυναικὸς ὡς ἀφράσμονος.
ἐγὼ δ' ἀτρέστῳ καρδίᾳ πρὸς εἰδότας
λέγω· σὺ δ' αἰνεῖν εἴτε με ψέγειν θέλεις
ὅμοιον· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἀγαμέμνων, ἐμὸς
πόσις, νεκρὸς δὲ τῆσδε δεξιᾶς χερὸς
ἔργον, δικαίας τέκτονος. τάδ' ὧδ' ἔχει.

ΧΟ. τί κακόν, ὦ γύναι, στρ.
χθονοτρεφὲς ἐδανὸν ἢ ποτὸν
πασαμένα ῥυτᾶς ἐξ ἁλὸς ὀρόμενον
τόδ' ἐπέθου θύος δημοθρόους τ' ἀράς;
ἀπέδικες, ἀπέταμες· ἀπόπολις δ' ἔσει,
μῖσος ὄμβριμον ἀστοῖς.

ΚΛ. νῦν μὲν δικάζεις ἐκ πόλεως φυγὴν ἐμοὶ

1408. ῥύσας. ὁρώμενον. 1410. ἄπολις.

1392. She repeats with mockery the respectful form of address used at *v.* 846: so in the following χαίροιτ' ἄν, εἰ χαίροιτε the echo of their implied rebuke (see *vv.* 1031—1033) is probably not accidental.

1394—1395. **εἰ ἦν...ὥστε** *if it had been a possible thing*, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 705 ἀλλ' ἔστι κἀκ τῶνδ' ὥστε σωθῆναι, τέκνον, Soph. *Phil.* 656 ἆρ' ἔστιν ὥστε κἀγγύθεν θέαν λαβεῖν; etc. (Paley).—**πρεπόντων** (τῶν πραγμάτων), *under fit circumstances*, *with good cause*, is an adverb to ἐπισπένδειν, but placed before ὥστε as taking the emphasis. It is a genitive absolute like ὧδ' ἐχόντων in *v.* 1392, and the subject of it is the same, *circumstances*, τῶν πραγμάτων. In fact it is this ὧδ' ἐχόντων which guides the construction of the sentence.—**τάδ' ἂν ἦν** πρέποντα πράγματα *these would be fitting circumstances.*—The grammar is clear and correct if we observe the construction of πρεπόντων. πρεπόντως Stanley, τῷδ' for τάδ' Tyrwhitt. We should avoid the translation *if it had been a fitting thing to pour libations*, which does not satisfy ὥστε.—**ἐπισπένδειν νεκρῷ**: if ever, that is, a death might justly be the subject of religious exultation.

1396. **κρατῆρα...κακῶν ἀραίων.** The

So stands the case, ye nobles of Argos here; be glad of it, if ye will; for me, I triumph upon it. And could there be case fit for a libation over the dead, justly and more than justly this would it be. With so many imprecations of suffering homes this man hath filled the bowl which himself returning hath drained.

Eld. We are astonished that thy mouth bears so bold a tongue, to boast over thy dead lord in such terms.

Cl. Ye challenge me, supposed an unthinking woman. But I speak with unshaken courage to those who know, indifferent whether thou choosest to praise or blame. This is Agamemnon, my husband, wrought to death by the just handicraft of this my hand. So stands the case.

Eld. What poison hast thou taken, woman, what drug born of the earth or draught from the great water, that thou hast brought on thyself the fury and the loud curses of yon folk? Thou hast cut off, cast off: and cast from communion shalt thou be, as a load on the people's hate.

Cl. Yes, now thou wouldst award to me exile from my

---

bowl 'full of the imprecations of suffering homes', which Agamemnon had filled for himself and now had returned to drink, is the *conjuration* against him, provoked by the sacrifice of Argive lives. See *vv.* 464, 1234, which interpret both the imagery and the meaning of this passage. This appeal to the real or supposed wrongs of the people is for the queen's applauding partizans. See next note.—**ἐν δόμοις κακῶν** together; see *v.* 439.

1401. **εἰδότας...σὺ δέ**: contrasted, not the same. *σύ* is the last speaker representing the elders. The *εἰδότες* to whom she appeals are her own fellow-conspirators. On the other hand some receive her with execrations (*v.* 1409).

1408. **ῥυτᾶς** (Stanley) **ἐξ ἁλός**: the sea serves as the type of water and *liquid* generally as opposed to *solid* (Paley). So *ὄμβρος* in Soph. *O. T.* 1428, where see Jebb's note. This generic sense seems to exclude such an epithet as *ῥυσᾶς wrinkled* (see MS.), which however is defended by Prof. Tyrrell (*Class. Rev.* XIV. 363), and is not metrically objectionable.—*ὁρμενον* Abresch.

1409. **θύος** *fury*, cf. *θύειν* to rage (Wecklein), not *sacrifice*, *incense*, parallel to the other *θύω*.—**τόδε**. They point to the crowd, which now includes many who have no connexion or sympathy with the conspiracy. But as an unprepared minority they are helpless.

1410. These exclamations seem sufficiently intelligible though not exactly constructed. 'As thou hast broken all bands, so shall all bands be broken with thee'.—**ἀπόπολις** Seidler. On the metre see *v.* 1430 and Appendix II. *ἀπέδικέ σ', ἀπέταμέν σ'* Wieseler, perhaps rightly. **ὄμβριμον** *i.e.* *ὄβριμον*, but the irregular form (with a *phonetic μ*) may be correct. —**μῖσος** 'object of hate'. *ἀστοῖς* depends both on *μῖσος* and on *ὄμβριμον* 'heavy to these people', *i.e.* a thing against which their hatred will rise and throw it off.

1412. **νῦν μὲν** *yes, now.* The guilt of taking life is a discovery which they have made in her particular case.

καὶ μῖσος ἀστῶν δημόθρους τ' ἔχειν ἀράς,
οὐ σὺν τόδ' ἀνδρὶ τῷδ' ἐναντίον φέρων·
ὃς οὐ προτιμῶν, ὡσπερεὶ βοτοῦ μόρον,
μήλων φλεόντων εὐπόκοις νομεύμασιν,
ἔθυσεν αὑτοῦ παῖδα, φιλτάτην ἐμοὶ
ὠδῖν', ἐπῳδὸν Θρῃκίων ἀημάτων.
οὐ τοῦτον ἐκ γῆς τῆσδε χρή σ' ἀνδρηλατεῖν,
μιασμάτων ἄποιν'; ἐπήκοος δ' ἐμῶν
ἔργων δικαστὴς τραχὺς εἶ. λέγω δέ σοι
τοιαῦτ' ἀπειλεῖν ὡς παρεσκευασμένης,
ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων χειρὶ νικήσαντ' ἐμοῦ
ἄρχειν, ἐὰν δὲ τοὔμπαλιν κραίνῃ θεός,
γνώσει διδαχθεὶς ὀψὲ γοῦν τὸ σωφρονεῖν.

ΧΟ. μεγαλόμητις εἶ, ἀντ.
περίφρονα δ' ἔλακες, ὥσπερ οὖν
φονολιβεῖ τύχᾳ φρὴν ἐπιμαίνεται.
λίπος ἐπ' ὀμμάτων αἵματος εὖ πρέπει.
ἀντίετον ἔτι σὲ χρὴ στερομέναν φίλων
τύμμα τύμματι τῖσαι.

ΚΛ. καὶ τήνδ' ἀκούεις ὁρκίων ἐμῶν θέμιν·
μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς δίκην,
Ἄτην Ἐρινύν θ', αἷσι τόνδ' ἔσφαξ' ἐγώ,
οὔ μοι φόβου μέλαθρον ἐλπὶς ἐμπατεῖ,

1414. *οὐ σὺν* corr. to *οὐδὲν*. 1418. *τε λημμάτων*. 1431. *τύμμα τίσαι*.

1413. **ἔχειν** *to bear*, explanatory infinitive.

1414. **σὺν** adverbial (*v.* 591), *and joinest not in laying that reproach against my husband here*. For *φέρειν to allege* see Demosth. 1328, 22 *πάσας αἰτίας οἴσειν* cited by L. and Sc. *s.v. φέρω*.—Or 'not alleging against him *as well as* against me', 'together with me'; but the arrangement of the words is against this.—**τόδε**: the reproach of murder.—From *οὐδὲν τόδ'* (correction in MS.) comes *οὐδὲν τότ'* (Voss), suggested by *νῦν μέν* in *v.* 1412. This antithesis is implied, but need not be explicitly completed. See further on *v.* 1419.

1418. **ἀημάτων** Canter.—**Θρῃκίων**: see *v.* 202.

1419. 'Shouldst thou not banish *him*?' This is not merely or altogether ironical. According to archaic law and religion, a corpse (as in the case of Polynices; see the *Seven Against Thebes*) could be both condemned and punished. —*χρῆν* (Porson) corresponds to the reading *οὐδὲν τότ'* in *v.* 1414.—**βιασμάτων** g, perhaps rightly.

1421—25. 'Threaten if you please,

country, the hate of the people and their loud curses to bear. Thou dost not join in laying that reproach against him who lies here, against him who, caring no more than for the death of a beast, though his fleecy herds had sheep enough, sacrificed his own child, the darling born of my pains, to charm the winds of Thrace. Is it not he whom thou shouldst banish from Argive soil for his foul crime? No, it is in judgment of me that thou art an auditor severe! But I warn thee, threatening thus, to think that I am prepared, ready that he who conquers me in fair fight should rule me; but if fate intends the contrary, thou wilt be taught, too late, the lesson of prudence.

Eld. Thou art proud of thought, and presumptuous is thy note; for indeed the murderous stroke is maddening thee. The blood-fleck in thine eyes is right natural. For all this, thou shalt find thyself friendless, and pay retaliatory stroke for stroke.

Cl. This also for thy hearing I solemnly swear. By the accomplished justice for my child, by Doom and Revenge, to whom I offered this dead man up, my hope doth not set foot in

---

but remember that I am prepared to fight the contest fairly and abide by the event'. **ἐκ...σωφρονεῖν** expresses, by sequent infinitive equivalent to *ὥστε*, the conditions for which she is prepared, namely 'that he who conquers me' etc. The second alternative, which for symmetry should have run in the infinitive, is turned into an independent clause.—**ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων** (with *νικήσαντα*) *on fair terms* is contemptuously ironical. She has her opponents at her mercy.—**νικήσαντα** for the prose *τὸν νικήσαντα*.—*κράνῃ* Herwerden.

1427. **ὥσπερ ... ἐπιμαίνεται,** literally 'as indeed with the blood-shedding stroke thy mind is frenzied', *i.e.* 'this outrageous defiance already displays the maddening fury, which sooner or later will bring thee to punishment'.

1429. *The blood-fleck on thine eye doth well beseem thee* or 'is right natural', referring not to a stain of blood from the murdered man (which does not suit *ἐπ' ὀμμάτων*) but rather to the bloodshot eye, which they see, or suppose themselves to see, in the furious face of the murderess. It is the bloody mind which shows there.

1430. **ἀντίετον**, if right, is a parallel form to *ἄντιτον* (cf. *ἀπεύχετος, ἀπευκτός*) meaning *retributive, paid back*, from *ἀνα-τίειν to pay back*, and is a predicate to *τύμμα*.—**ἀτίετον** (*Cod. Farn.*) is a similar equivalent for *ἄτιτον unavenged*, a predicate to *σέ*.—See Appendix II.

1431. **τύμματι** I. Voss.

1432. **ὁρκίων...θέμιν** 'solemnity of an oath', *i.e.* solemn oath.—**ἀκούεις,** for what *is to be* heard, is inaccurate and irregular, though perhaps not impossible. *ἄκουέ γ'* Herwerden, *ἀκούσει γ'* Headlam.

1434. **Ἄτην Ἐρινύν θ'** in apposition to *δίκην*.

1435. "*My hope walks not in the house of fear.* A fine picturesque phrase, surely not too imaginative or metaphorical for Aeschylus: she means 'My hope does not approach fear; my confidence is dashed with no misgivings.'" Sidgwick.—*ἐμπατεῖν* Victorius.

ἕως ἂν αἴθῃ πῦρ ἐφ' ἑστίας ἐμὰς
Αἴγισθος, ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν εὖ φρονῶν ἐμοί.
οὗτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀσπὶς οὐ σμικρὰ θράσους
κεῖται γυναικὸς τῆσδε λυμαντήριος,
Χρυσηίδων μείλιγμα τῶν ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ,
ἥ τ' αἰχμάλωτος ἥδε καὶ τερασκόπος
καὶ κοινόλεκτρος τοῦδε θεσφατηλόγος,
πιστὴ ξύνευνος ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων,
ἱστοτριβής. ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην·
ὁ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως, ἡ δέ τοι κύκνου δίκην
τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον
κεῖται φιλήτως τοῦδ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν
εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς.
ΧΟ. φεῦ, τίς ἂν ἐν τάχει, μὴ περιώδυνος, στρ. α'.
μηδὲ δεμνιοτήρης,
μόλοι τὸν αἰεὶ φέρουσ' ἐν ἡμῖν
Μοῖρ' ἀτέλευτον ὕπνον, δαμέντος
φύλακος εὐμενεστάτου καὶ
πολλὰ τλάντος γυναικὸς διαί,
πρὸς γυναικὸς δ' ἀπέφθισεν βίον.

1436. *Kindles fire for the lighting of mine altars, i.e.* shares my home and power. The form of expression is adapted to Aegisthus' last exploit, the beacon-fire and the consequent 'sending round' of sacrifice (*περίπεμψις vv.* 87—96) to the houses and altars (*v.* 600) of Argos, in fact to the whole successful conduct of the conspiracy. See the Introduction. For the plural *ἑστίας*, see Eur. *Her.* 145 *πολλῶν ἑστίαι*. In thus speaking of Argos as *hers* Clytaemnestra significantly assumes on behalf of herself and Aegisthus the place of the dead king.—For the use of *ἐπί* see L. and Sc. *s. v.* C. III. 1.—*ἐμῆς* Porson.

1438. Literally 'he there (a broad shield of confidence to us) lies as the outrager of his wife here...and she also' etc. The words *ἀσπὶς...θράσους* are in apposition not to *οὗτος* but to the whole statement *οὗτος κεῖται...λυμαντήριος, ἥ τε κτλ.* Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra can face the world, when they can point to the husband laid beside the mistress whom he proposed to place in his house (see Eur. *El.* 1032).

1439. **τῆσδε**: she points to herself.

1440. See Hom. *Il.* 1. 378.

1443. **πιστὴ ... σελμάτων**, literally 'faithful bed-partner, though of the ship's bench': **σελμάτων** depends upon *ξύνευνος* as a word 'of sharing'. **δέ**, antithetic, as if to *πιστὴ μέν*: this will still apply if we take together *ναυτίλων...ἱστοτριβής*.

1444. **ἱστοτριβής.** It is best to leave this, even if we cannot explain it. We have not that knowledge of sailors' lan-

the house of fear, so long as fire be kindled for the lighting of my hearths by Aegisthus, still devoted as ever to me.

For there, as our broad shield of confidence, lies, outraging his wife, my husband—the darling of each Chryseis in the Trojan camp!—and with him his captive, his auguress, his oracle-monger mistress, who shared with him faithfully even the ship's bench and the canvas! But they did it not unpunished! For he lies as ye see, and she, having sung swan-like her last sad song of death, lies by him loveably, adding to the sweet of my triumph a spice of sex.

Eld. Ah, could some death come quick, which without agony, without pillowed watch, might bring to us the endless sleep, now that our kindest protector is laid low, who, having much endured for a woman's sin, hath by a woman lost his life!

---

guage in Aeschylus' time, which would enable us to say what terms a woman like Clytaemnestra might borrow from it to apply to a woman like Cassandra, or what those terms might mean.—*ἰσοτριβής* (Pauw): *ναυτίλων σελμάτων ἰσοτριβής* is variously translated, 'nautis aeque cum transtris trita', or 'sharing alike with him the mariner's bench': *sed quaere.*

1445—1447. **ὁ μὲν...τοῦδε** *for he lies as ye see, and she like his beloved*, literally 'she lies loveably to him (as he to her)'. The adverbs *οὕτως* and *φιλήτως* are parallel. The genitive **τοῦδε** (if right) is modelled on the genitive of *relation in place*, as in Thuc. I. 36. 2 *τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Σικελίας καλῶς παράπλου κεῖται* (ἡ Κέρκυρα), Herod. 2. 112 *τοῦ Ἡφαιστηΐου πρὸς νότον ἄνεμον κείμενον*: cf. the genitive with *ἄγχι, ἐντός, ὄπισθεν* etc., and see Kühner, *Gr. Grammar* § 418. 8 a. The dative *τῷδε* would be simpler (see *v.* 1581).—**φιλήτωρ** (*lover*, from *φιλέω*) g (and *Cod. Farn.*) has the appearance of a conjecture, and, if such, does not account for the reading *φιλήτως*.

1447. To the joy of revenge for her daughter, and other satisfactions of the moment, the coming and death of Cassandra have added the sweetness of revenge for her injuries as a woman and a wife. **εὐνῆς** stands to **παροψώνημα** in the relation of a qualifying adjective, 'concerned with *εὐνή*' *i.e.* with the relations of sex, while **χλιδῆς** is an objective genitive depending on *παροψώνημα* in its verbal aspect, 'an extra-dish added *to*'. For the combination of genitives cf. Soph. *Ai.* 308 *ἐν ἐρειπίοις-νεκρῶν ἀρνείου φόνου*, literally 'in the corpse-wreckage of slain sheep', id. *Trach.* 1191 *τὸν Οἴτης Ζηνὸς πάγον*, Eur. *Phoen.* 308 *βοστρύχων...χαίτας-πλόκαμον* 'hair-plait of locks', and see Kühner, *Gr. Grammar* § 414, 4, note 3.—*χλιδήν* Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XIV. 117, XVII. 245, taking *εὐ. π. τῆς ἐμῆς* (nominative) as a description of Cassandra.

1451. **ἐν ἡμῖν**: dubious, but defended by Conington and others and perhaps justifiable in the sense 'bringing *into* us'; cf. Eur. *Med.* 424 *ἐν ἁμετέρᾳ γνώμᾳ ὤπασε θέσπιν ἀοιδάν* *put into our minds the gift of inspired song.*—**φέρουσ' ἂν ἡμῖν** (Emperius) 'to bring us *perchance* eternal sleep'.

1455. For the change from the participial (**τλάντος**) to the independent construction (**ἀπέφθισεν δέ**) see *v.* 1287, and *vv.* 1457—1460 below.

ἰὼ παρανόμους† Ἑλένα,
μία τὰς πολλάς, τὰς πάνυ πολλὰς
ψυχὰς ὀλέσασ' ὑπὸ Τροίᾳ,
νῦν δὲ τελείαν
πολύμναστον ἐπηνθίσω δι' αἷμ' ἄνιπτον.
ἦ τις ἦν τότ' ἐν δόμοις
ἔρις ἐρίδματος ἀνδρὸς οἰζύς.
ΚΛ. μηδὲν θανάτου μοῖραν ἐπεύχου
τοῖσδε βαρυνθείς·
μηδ' εἰς Ἑλένην κότον ἐκτρέχῃς†,
ὡς ἀνδρολέτειρ', ὡς μία πολλῶν
ἀνδρῶν ψυχὰς Δαναῶν ὀλέσασ'
ἀξύστατον ἄλγος ἔπραξεν.
ΧΟ. δαῖμον, ὃς ἐμπίτνεις δώμασι καὶ διφυί- ἀντ. α΄.
οισι Τανταλίδαισιν,

1461. ἤτις. 1467. ὀλέσαν.
1469. ἐμπίπτεις. διφυεῖσι.

1456—1462. These lines are probably to be repeated as an 'ephymnium' or *burden* in the antistrophe after *v.* 1475 as there indicated (Burney, followed by Wecklein; cf. *vv.* 1490 and 1514). They may however be recitative not included in the *strophe.*—The suggestion of Hermann that these lines were originally antistrophic to *vv.* 1539—1549 is not probable. There is no appearance here of such injury to the text (loss of several verses and other damage) as we must on that theory suppose.

1456 was perhaps originally anapaestic (though **παρανομοῦσα** is good in sense, *Alas for the transgression of Helen!*). If so, **ἰὼ παρὰ πῦρ ὄνομ' οὖσ' Ἑλένα** (Housman) has some probability, literally 'Ah thou, named *Helen* from fire', *i.e.* 'whose name is a symbol of destruction', the derivation indicated being from ἑλάνη *fire-brand.* "I think I find the same etymology in Euripides. In *Tro.* 891 *sqq.* Hecuba is warning Menelaus against the charms of Helen ὁρᾶν δὲ τήνδε φεῦγε, μή σ' ἕλῃ πόθῳ· | αἱρεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματ', ἐξαιρεῖ πόλεις—so far the ἔτυμον is ἑλεῖν (see *supra v.* 693); but then she goes on—πίμπρησι δ' οἴκους: surely that is a glance at ἑλάνη" (*J. Ph.* XVI. p. 282). The facility of the supposed corruption is obvious.—ἰὼ σὺ παρώνυμος οὖσ' Ἑλένα Wecklein.

1457—1460. Literally 'and now thou hast crowned thyself with (the destroying of) a final life, (a destruction) memorable because the blood cannot be washed off'. **ὀλέσασα...νῦν δὲ ἐπηνθίσω.** For the syntax see *v.* 1455.—With **τελείαν** the words ψυχὰν ὀλομέναν are supplied from the previous sentence.—**ἐπηνθίσω ψυχὰν ὀλομέναν**: Helen is compared to a conqueror whose glory is the lives he takes; ἐπανθίζεσθαι is 'to take on oneself as a crown' or 'glory', a metaphor from ἄνθος *a wreath.* See *Theb.* 933 ἰὼ πολ-

Oh...Helen, who didst alone destroy that multitude, that great multitude of lives at Troy, now, for thy final crown, thou hast destroyed one, the stain of whose murder shall not be washed away! Surely there hath been in this house a hard-fought rivalry of fatal wives.

Cl. Nay, pray not for death in indignation at this. Nor turn thine anger on Helen, as if alone in destruction she had destroyed that multitude of Argive lives and wrought incomparable woe.

Eld. Oh Curse, how hast thou fallen on Tantalus' house in

λοῖς ἐπανθίσαντες πόνοισι γενεάν *Oh with many a gallant feat have ye crowned your lineage*, and for illustrations see the note there. For the representation of the deed as a crown see πόνοις in *Theb. l. c.* and an exact parallel in *Theb.* 705 ἀλλ' αὐτάδελφον αἷμα δρέψασθαι θέλεις; *Is the blood of a brother the prize thou wouldst pluck?*, where also see note.—**πολύμναστον** (feminine, agreeing with ψυχὰν) **δι' αἷμ' ἄνιπτον** together.—There is no irregularity in these lines, nor any reason to suspect them. They are thoroughly Aeschylean both in thought and expression.

1461—1462. **ἦ τις** Schütz: *Surely there must have been erewhile between the houses a hard-fought rivalry for the misery of their lords*, literally 'of the husband'. Evil powers might seem to have played a match for the ruin of Agamemnon and Menelaus by means of the two wicked sisters, their wives, Clytaemnestra and Helen. The parallel has been suggested already in *vv.* 1454—55 and is further pursued below, *v.* 1469.—**τότε** *formerly, in the past*, at the time of the marriages.—**ἐν δόμοις** *in the house, i.e.* between the two branches of the Atridae.—**ἔρις... οἰζύς**: literally 'contention contention-surpassed, a misery to the husband'; for the apposition of οἰζύς in the sense 'causing misery' see on *v.* 298. **ἔρις ἐρίδματος** is an artificial but not unnatural figure of poetry for 'a contest in which effort surpasses effort'. In this fatal rivalry it were hard to say which of the sisters had done better.

1463. **μηδὲν**: emphatic negative, see *v.* 783.

1465. **ἐκτρέχῃς** f: **ἐκτρέψῃς** g and *Cod. Farn.* It is more likely that ἐκτρέχῃς covers some less familiar word or form.

1467. **ὀλέσαν** agreeing with ἄλγος, f, g. **ὀλέσασ'** *Cod. Farn.*

1468. **ἀξύστατον** (1) *incomparable* Klausen, Paley, *unexampled* Kennedy; literally 'that which cannot be weighed or balanced with' an equal. Clytaemnestra ironically affects to depreciate Helen's superiority in the mere number of her victims.—(2) *incurable* 'not to be healed' or 'closed', as a disease or wound. This is a possible sense, but not much to the point.—It should be noted (Sidgwick) that in Aristoph. *Clouds* 1367 ἀξύστατος is applied in some sense, which is apparently not that of this passage, to Aeschylus himself. But the word admits by etymology many meanings, and like other poetical compounds, it would follow the context.

1469. **δαῖμον**: an apostrophe or exclamation, not an address. **ἐμπίτνεις** Canter. **διφυίοισι** Hermann. The Chorus correct their judgment so far as that they attribute the fatal work of Helen and Clytaemnestra in the last resort to the evil genius of the race, and put the two sisters on the same level of triumph or shame.

κράτος τ' ἰσόψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν
καρδιόδηκτον ἐμοὶ κρατύνεις.
ἐπὶ δὲ σώματος δίκαν μοι
κόρακος ἐχθροῦ σταθεὶς ἐννόμως
ὕμνον ὑμνεῖν ἐπεύχετ' εὔχεται.
<ἰὼ παρανόμους† Ἑλένα κτλ.>
ΚΛ. νῦν δ' ὤρθωσας στόματος γνώμην,
τὸν τριπάχυιον
δαίμονα γέννης τῆσδε κικλήσκων.
ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἔρως αἱματολοιχὸς
νείρᾳ τρέφεται, πρὶν καταλῆξαι
τὸ παλαιὸν ἄχος, νέος ἰχώρ.†
ΧΟ. ἦ μέγαν οἴκοις τοῖσδε στρ. β′.
δαίμονα καὶ βαρύμηνιν αἰνεῖς,
φεῦ φεῦ, κακὸν αἶνον ἀτη-
ρᾶς τύχας ἀκορέστου·
ἰὼ ἰή, διαὶ Διὸς
παναιτίου πανεργέτα.
τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἄνευ Διὸς τελεῖται;
τί τῶνδ' οὐ θεόκραντόν ἐστιν;
ἰὼ βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ,
πῶς σε δακρύσω;
φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας τί ποτ' εἴπω;
κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ'

1471. Omits τε. 1472. καρδία δηκτὸν. 1475. ὑμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται. 1480. νείρει. 1487. πανεργέταν.

1471—1472. **τ'** Hermann. **καρδιόδηκτον** Abresch. Literally 'and winnest a victory, equal in lives on the part of the (respective) wives, that wounds me to the heart'. **κράτος ἰσόψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν.** This bold phrase is explained by the preceding context. In *vv.* 1457—60 Helen was ironically praised as a victor who had destroyed many lives (ψυχάς). Clytaemnestra, accepting and retorting the irony, disputes the superiority accorded to Helen (*v.* 1466 μία πολλῶν ψυχάς). Here the Chorus, still in the same strain, divide the credit, as it were, saying that fate has won by means of the two wives a victory (κράτος) *equal in lives* as between them; *i.e.* one in which they may share the destruction equally. — *ἰσόψυχον like-minded* Paley; but the compounds of *ἰσο-* rarely, if ever, have this sense (*like*) in classical Greek but only that of *equality* or *equivalence*, nor does this meaning fit

either branch, and shared between two women a life-destroying victory for which my heart is sore! Lo, on the body, methinks, like a foul bird of prey she stands, boasting to celebrate a triumph lawful and just.

Oh...Helen, who didst alone etc.

Cl. Nay, now thou hast mended the judgment of thy lips, in that thou callest upon the fat-fed Curse of this race. For therefrom is bred this craving of the maw for blood to lick, ever new gore (?), ere the old woe be done.

Eld. Verily mighty he is and malignant, the Curse of this house, of whose never-sated cruelty thou dost, alas, so grievously testify. And oh, and oh, it cometh by Zeus, the cause of all, the doer of all! For what without Him is accomplished upon men? What of all this is not of divine appointment?

O king, O king, how shall I weep for thee? Out of my heart's love what shall I say? And thou didst lie in this spider-

---

the context.

1473. **δίκαν μοι κόρακος** together: *like a foul bird of prey, methinks.*

1474—1475. **σταθεὶς** *i.e.* the *δαίμων* in the shape of Clytaemnestra.—*σταθεῖσ'* Schütz.—**ἐννόμως...εὔχεται**, literally 'boasts that lawfully he celebrates a (theme) proper for exultation', referring to Clytaemnestra's words (*v.* 1393) *ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεύχομαι· εἰ δ' ἦν κτλ.*—**ἐπεύχετα** *matter for boasting over* is object to *ὕμνον ὑμνεῖν*. For the form see *ἀπεύχετος* and cf. *χαρτά matter for rejoicing*, as in Soph. *Trach.* 228 *χαρτὸν εἴ τι καὶ φέρεις.*—I suggest this as a simple restoration of the metre; see *v.* 1455.

1476. **νῦν δέ** *Aye, but now thou hast corrected thy saying*, etc.

1477. **τριπάχυιον**: perhaps created on the false analogy of such forms as *δίφυιος.*—*τριπάχυντον* Bamberger.

1479. The apposition of the description **πρὶν...ἰχώρ** to *ἔρως αἱματολοιχὸς τρέφεται* is a very bold extension of the Aeschylean use noted on *v.* 1462 and elsewhere. Nor is the use of *ἰχώρ* beyond suspicion. Dr Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XII. 247) proposes **νέον ἶχαρ** *a fresh appetite*, or **νέος ἶχαρ** *fresh in appetite*, forming *ἶχαρ* from *ἰχανᾶν* (= *ἰσχανᾶν q.v.*) on the analogy of *μῆχαρ* and *μηχανᾶν*. I think this probably right. See also *ib.* XIV. 119.—**νείρᾳ** Casaubon, Wellauer, on the evidence of Hesychius, *νείρῃ· κοιλία ἐσχάτῃ*, perhaps rightly. But there is no proof against the existence of the form *νεῖρος.*

1482. On the metre see Appendix II.

1483. **αἰνεῖς** *thou dost celebrate*, *i.e.* testify to his power.

1484. **κακὸν...ἀκορέστου**: literally 'a fatal praise of him as never tiring of deadly stroke'. The genitive *τύχας* depends on *ἀκορέστου* (masculine).

1487. **πανεργέτα** *Cod. Farn.* Doric genitive of *πανεργέτας.*

1490. *ἰὼ ἰὼ Cod. Farn.*

1493. **κεῖσαι δ'...ἐκπνέων** *And to think of thee lying*, etc. From *ἐκπνέων*, which (by the tense) cannot refer to the corpse, it is seen that *κεῖσαι* is a *historic* present.—**ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι** *i.e.* the enveloping *ἀμφίβληστρον*: but in relation to the whole plot the term has more significance than the speakers know, a favourite device with Aeschylus and with the Attic poets generally. See *v.* 321 *Ἀραχναῖον αἶπος*, and the Introduction.

ἀσεβεῖ θανάτῳ βίον ἐκπνέων,
ὤμοι μοι, κοίταν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον,
δολίῳ μόρῳ δαμεὶς
ἐκ χερὸς ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνῳ.
ΚΛ. αὐχεῖς εἶναι τόδε τοὔργον ἐμόν;
μηδ' ἐπιλεχθῇς
Ἀγαμεμνονίαν εἶναί μ' ἄλοχον.
φανταζόμενος δὲ γυναικὶ νεκροῦ
τοῦδ' ὁ παλαιὸς δριμὺς ἀλάστωρ
Ἀτρέως χαλεποῦ θοινατῆρος
τόνδ' ἀπέτισεν
τέλεον νεαροῖς ἐπιθύσας.
ΧΟ. ὡς μὲν ἀναίτιος εἶ — ἀντ. β'.
τοῦδε φόνου τίς ὁ μαρτυρήσων;
πῶ πῶ; πατρόθεν δὲ συλλή-
πτωρ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀλάστωρ.
βιάζεται δ' ὁμοσπόροις
ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἱμάτων
μέλας Ἄρης ὁ παιδικᾷ προσβαίνων
πάχνᾳ, κουροβόρῳ παρέξει.
ἰὼ βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ,
πῶς σε δακρύσω;
φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας τί ποτ' εἴπω;
κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ'

1512. ὅποι δὲ καί. 1513. πάχνα.

1495. **κοίταν** accusative 'cognate' to κεῖσαι.—**ἀνελεύθερον** *unfree* i.e. *of a slave*, a peculiar and significant expression. ἐλεύθερος is a term proper to legal, political, or social relations. A fly in a spider's web would not be called ἀνελεύθερος, nor a man merely because his limbs were entangled. But the fall of Agamemnon is properly ἀνελεύθερος, because the murder is the first act and sign of the new τυραννίς. See *v.* 1354 and contrast the description of Orestes' enterprise in *Cho.* 862 φῶς ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ δαίων ἀρχαῖς τε πολισσονόμοις (*free and lawful government*). It is not so much the man who is lamented as the legitimate royalty and liberties of Argos, destroyed in his person. The implied thought is put explicitly by Shakespeare's Antony (*Jul. C.* 3. 2. 194) 'Great Caesar fell. O, what a fall was there, my countrymen! Then I and you and

web, dying by a wicked death, ah me, on this couch of slavery struck down by a crafty arm with a weapon of double edge!

Cl. Darest thou say this deed was mine? Imagine not that I am Agamemnon's spouse. No, in the shape of this dead man's wife, the bitter fiend, long since provoked by Atreus the cruel feaster, hath made by this full-grown victim payment for those slain babes.

Eld. That thou art guiltless of this murder, who shall aver? It cannot, cannot be: though perchance the fiend of his sire might be thy helper. He riots in fresh streams of kindred gore, the red Manslayer, drawn to the infant blood-slot of the child-flesh served for meat.

O king, O king, how shall I weep for thee? Out of my heart's love what shall I say? And thou didst lie in this spider-

---

all of us fell down, Whilst bloody treason flourish'd over us'.

1499. **μηδ' ἐπιλέχθῃς κτλ.**: literally '*do not even suppose* that this is I at all'. For the deponent meaning of the tense ἐπελέχθην (for which ἐπελεξάμην would be more regular) cf. προσδέρχθῃ *P. V.* 53, ὑποδεχθεὶς Eur. *Her.* 757, ἐφράσθη id. *Hec.* 546, διελέχθην frequently, etc. (Paley).

1503. **θοινατῆρος**: to Thyestes; see *v.* 1590 foll.

1504. **τόνδ' ἀπέτισεν** *hath made him to be payment for* the slain children (Conington); not *punished* (ἀπετίσατο).

1505. Literally 'making the full-grown victim follow the young'; for τέλεος in the ritual sense see *v.* 963.

1508. **πῶ**; Doric form of ποῦ *where?* used, like πῶς; and πόθεν; in the sense *How should it be? Impossible.* Cf. πώμαλα *not at all.* (Hermann.) Wecklein cites Athen. 9 p. 402 C ὅτι Αἰσχύλος διατρίψας ἐν Σικελίᾳ πολλαῖς κέχρηται φωναῖς Σικελικαῖς οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, a mistaken explanation, but noticeable, as to the matter of fact, both here and in connexion with *v.* 686.—**πατρόθεν** *by heredity.* —**συλλήπτωρ γένοιτ' ἂν** *might be found assistant* (*in the deed*). The fiend, punishing the crime inherited from Atreus, might be thought to have part in the act, which yet is the queen's.

1510—1512. For the conception of *Ares* as a man-devouring fiend, see on *v.* 647.—**μέλας**: see *Theb.* 43.—**πάχνᾳ** (corrected to the dative by Hermann) is locative. With προβαίνων (Canter, on metrical grounds) πάχνᾳ would be instrumental, meaning 'drawn on by the blood'. πάχνη is properly the *clot*, or blood *congealed* (see πήγνυμι, πεπηγώς), and the notion (whether with προβαίνων or προσβαίνων) is that the old crime is a *lure* which brings the fiend of murder again to the house. On the metrical question see Appendix II.—**παιδικᾷ**: see *v.* 1593 παρέσχε δαῖτα παιδείων κρεῶν, and for parallel uses of the form in -ικος cf. ὑικὸν δέρμα *skin of a pig*, ἱππικὰ φρυάγματα *neighing of horses*, ἀνδρικὸς ἱδρὼς *sweat of a man*, etc.—**κουροβόρῳ παρέξει** in apposition, literally 'the serving of children as meat', *i.e.* 'children served as meat', the abstract πάρεξις (from παρασχεῖν, see *v.* 1593 above cited) being used for the concrete, *serving* for that which is *served*.—For other corrections suggested see Wecklein's Appendix.

ἀσεβεῖ θανάτῳ βίον ἐκπνέων,
ὤμοι μοι, κοίταν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον,
δολίῳ μόρῳ δαμεὶς
ἐκ χερὸς ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνῳ.

ΧΟ. β΄. οὔτ' ἀνελεύθερον οἶμαι θάνατον
τῷδε γενέσθαι,—

ΚΛ. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος δολίαν ἄτην
οἴκοισιν ἔθηκ';
ἀλλ' ἐμὸν ἐκ τοῦδ' ἔρνος ἀερθὲν
τὴν πολύκλαυτόν τ' Ἰφιγένειαν†
ἀνάξια δράσας ἄξια πάσχων
μηδὲν ἐν Ἅιδου μεγαλαυχείτω,
ξιφοδηλήτῳ
θανάτῳ τίσας ἅπερ ἦρξεν.

ΧΟ. ἀμηχανῶ φροντίδος στερηθεὶς στρ. γ΄.
εὐπάλαμον μέριμναν,
ὅπᾳ τράπωμαι, πίτνοντος οἴκου.
δέδοικα δ' ὄμβρου κτύπον δομοσφαλῆ
τὸν αἱματηρόν. ψεκὰς δὲ λήγει,
Δίκα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα θηγάνει βλάβης
πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάναις † μοῖρα.

1533. εὐπάλαμνον. 1537. θήγει.

1522—23. One of the queen's party, indignant at the repeated accusation of setting up a τυραννὶς (see on *v.* 1495), begins to answer the elders on this point, *This man, methinks, is not the victim of despotism, nor*—, but here Clytaemnestra, who is in no mood for such a discussion, fiercely breaks out again upon her personal wrongs. The incident is significant. In every revolution a large part is played by those who are deceived as to the nature of their cause and the effect of their action. For the truth of the scene and with a view to the counter-revolution in the *Choephori*, it is proper that the error and disappointment of this class should be shown. The speaker, who would defend the murder as tyrannicide, is wrong and the elders right: Clytaemnestra could stand only by the suppression of all law and opinion. Her behaviour is already ominous, and before the end of the play the situation defines itself beyond mistake.—These lines, which cannot be spoken by any one of the *dramatis personae* noticed in the MS. list, are generally struck out as an interpolation (Seidler), but see notes on *v.* 363 and *v.* 1649, and Appendix III.

1524. **οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος κτλ.**: literally 'Then did not he either (or 'he on his part') commit treachery against his house?' *i.e.* 'It is hard forsooth that he should suffer treachery (*v.* 1520), for he did not practise it!'

1526—28. We may accept either

web, dying by a wicked death, ah me, on this couch of slavery, struck down by a crafty arm with a weapon of double edge!

A Conspirator. His death, methinks, is not a death of slavery, nor—

Cl. And did he not then himself do a crafty crime against his house? Nay, for the thing he did to the blossom born of me and him, my long-wept Iphigenia, justice is done upon him! Let him not boast in Hades, for he hath paid, as he sinned, with death.

Eld. My mind is blank and I find no ready thought, which way to fly from the tottering house. The storm will strike it, I fear, and wreck it quite, the storm of blood. The rain is ceasing; yet Justice is but whetting once more, on the whetstone of impediment, her sword to punish again.

Elmsley's *τὴν πολύκλαυτον, ἀνάξια δράσας, | ἄξια πάσχων, | μηδὲν*, or with *τὴν πολύκλαυτόν γ' | ἄξια δράσας* (Hermann, Pauw), or **πολυκλαύτην Ἰφιγένειαν** (paroemiac verse; Headlam) **ἄξια δράσας κτλ.** The last seems preferable, as accounting best for the corruption through ignorance of the exceptional feminine, and the filling up of the paroemiac.—*ἄξια...ἄξια* will then be correlative and pleonastic. The deed is worthy of the punishment, the punishment of the deed. (Sidgwick).

1531. **ἦρξεν**: from *ἄρχειν* *to be the aggressor, to do an injury unprovoked.* Eur. *fr.* 825 Dind. *τιμωρίαν ἔτισεν ὧν ἦρξεν κακῶν*, and id. *H. F.* 1169 *τίνων δ' ἀμοιβὰς ὧν ὑπῆρξεν Ἡρακλῆς* (Housman, *J. Ph.* XVI. p. 283).

1532. 'There are indeed injuries on both sides. It is a fatal story of wrong and retribution. And we must look for more to follow. The family is accursed'. The bold figure, a man expelled from his ruined cottage by a storm and vainly seeking shelter, must not be pressed too closely (the 'falling house' typifies vaguely the accursed family, yet the speaker is not himself exposed to the curse), but it is impressive.

1532. **ἀμηχανῶ φροντίδος** together, I am 'at a loss for thought', **εὐπάλαμον μέριμναν** with *στερηθεὶς* 'deprived of'.—**δέδοικα δέ...ψεκὰς δέ...Δίκα δέ.** After the fashion of the archaic *λέξις εἰρομένη*, the sentences are simply strung together, their exact relations being left to the understanding. In the two last clauses the **δέ** is slightly adversative; after each outburst of the storm there is indeed a pause, but it is the pause of preparation for the next stroke, or as the poet puts it, changing the metaphor, *Justice is sharpening her sword.* Such a time of pause between stroke and stroke is actually now just beginning; but *ψεκὰς λήγει* is rather general than particular. The same sense might have been put thus, *when the rain ceases, then* etc.—The former interpretation of *ψεκὰς λήγει* (*no longer it comes in drops, i.e.* the rain begins to be heavy) is incredible. In no language could 'the shower *is ceasing*' stand for 'there is falling *more than* a shower'.—**πρᾶγμα** *exaction, punishment,* not *deed*: the association of *πράσσειν* with *δίκη* in this sense is so common, that *πρᾶγμα* takes colour from the juxtaposition.—**θηγάνει** Hermann.—**βλάβης...θηγάναις** *whetstones of hindrance*; the interval during which crime (as in the case of Clytaemnestra) may hold off punishment serves Justice

ἰὼ γᾶ γᾶ, εἴθε μ' ἐδέξω,
πρὶν τόνδ' ἐπιδεῖν ἀργυροτοίχου
δροίτας κατέχοντα χαμεύναν.
τίς ὁ θάψων νιν; τίς ὁ θρηνήσων;
ἢ σὺ τόδ' ἔρξαι τλήσῃ, κτείνασ'
ἄνδρα τὸν αὑτῆς ἀποκωκῦσαι
ψυχήν, ἄχαριν χάριν ἀντ' ἔργων
μεγάλων ἀδίκως ἐπικρᾶναι;
τίς δ' ἐπιτύμβιος αἶνος ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ θείῳ
ξὺν δακρύοις ἰάπτων
ἀληθείᾳ φρενῶν πονήσει;
ΚΛ. οὐ σὲ προσήκει τὸ μέλημ' ἀλέγειν
τοῦτο· πρὸς ἡμῶν
κάππεσε, κάτθανε, καὶ καταθάψομεν,
οὐχ ὑπὸ κλαυθμῶν τῶν ἐξ οἴκων,
ἀλλ' Ἰφιγένειά νιν ἀσπασίως
θυγάτηρ, ὡς χρή,
πατέρ' ἀντιάσασα πρὸς ὠκύπορον
πόρθμευμ' ἀχέων
περὶ χεῖρα βαλοῦσα φιλήσει.
ΧΟ. ὄνειδος ἥκει τόδ' ἀντ' ὀνείδους. ἀντ. γ'.
δύσμαχα δ' ἐστὶ κρῖναι.
φέρει φέροντ', ἐκτίνει δ' ὁ καίνων.
μίμνει δὲ μίμνοντος ἐν χρόνῳ Διὸς
παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα· θέσμιον γάρ.
τίς ἂν γονὰν ἀραῖον ἐκβάλοι δόμων;
κεκόλληται γένος προσάψαι.

1539. 'hemichorii notam habent f g'.
1550. *μέλημα λέγειν.* 1558. *ιφλήσῃ.*
1562. *χρόνω* (*i.e. χρόνῳ*). 1564. *ῥᾶον.*

---

to prepare the stroke. For *βλάβη hindrance*, from *βλάπτειν hinder*, see on *Theb.* 183.—It is possible also to take *βλάβης* with *πρᾶγμα* in the sense *deed of harm*.—**μοῖρα** covers some accusative, signifying the instrument which *Δίκη* whets. **θηγάναις μάχαιραν** Musgrave, **θηγάνασιν ἄορ** Housman. Possibly it is a word unknown.—Or we may correct **δίκα** to *δίκαν*, *Fate sharpens Justice.*

O earth, earth, would that thou hadst received me, before I had seen my lord laid thus low in the silver-sided bath! Who shall bury him? Who sing his dirge? Wilt thou dare to do it, thou, that hast slain thy husband, dare to lament his parted soul? The compensation will scarce atone the offence! But who will stand over the hero's grave, and pour forth the tearful praise with heart that truly aches?

Cl. It belongs not to thee to regard this care. By us he fell, he died, and we will bury him, not with weeping of his household, no, but Iphigenia his daughter, as is fit, will meet her father with joy at the swift passage of the sorrowful ford, and fling her arms around him, and give him a kiss.

Eld. Thus is reproach answered with other reproach! 'Tis a hard case to judge. The spoiler spoiled, the slayer amerced! And it abides, while Zeus abides in time, that to him that doeth it shall be done: for lawful is it. Who can expel the cursed breed from the house? It is a kind that sticketh fast.

1539—1549. Apparently a burden to be repeated after *v.* 1565 (Burney).

1545. **ἄχαριν κτλ.** *A thankless compensation to award for an injury not fairly proportioned to it!* an ironically moderate expostulation.—**μεγάλων ἀδίκως**, literally 'unfairly great', are to be taken together (not *ἀδίκως ἐπικρᾶναι*).

1547. **ἐπιτύμβιος**, a participial adjective agreeing with **τίς**: cf. *ὄρθριος*, *καίριος ποιεῖν τι*, etc.—**αἶνος**. May not this be *neuter accusative*, a parallel form to *αἶνον*, like the comparatively rare *εὖχος* beside *εὐχήν*? The word had certainly two forms (see *αἴνη*) and might well have a third. Moreover the forms *αἰνέ-σω*, *αἰνε-τός* would lead us to expect a corresponding substantival form *αἶνος* (genit. *αἴνεος*): cf. *εὖχος*, *ἀπεύχετος*, *τέλος*, *τελέσω*, *γένος*, *γενέτης* etc.—*ἐπιτύμβιον αἶνον* Voss.

1549. **πονήσει** *will suffer*. On the relation of the verb and participle, see *v.* 970 etc.

1550. **μέλημ' ἀλέγειν** (Karsten) *to regard this duty*.—If these anapaests were originally antistrophic to *vv.* 1566—1576, two lines have been lost here or inserted there. But there is no trace of this in the text.

1557. *ἀχείων* (originally *ἀχαιῶν*) g.

1558. **φιλήσει** Stanley.

1562. **μίμνοντος ἐν χρόνῳ Διός** *so long as Zeus abides in time*, i.e. *for ever*, the notion that Zeus might have an end being suggested only as inconceivable.—*θρόνῳ* Schütz. The erroneous substitution of *χρόνος* for *θρόνος* is supposed to occur also in *Eum.* 18 and *Eum.* 1001; and in the former edition these examples were allowed, but wrongly, as I propose to show in commenting on the *Eumenides*. Nor should the change be made here.

1564. **γονὰν ἀραῖον** Hermann, *the accursed breed* of successive sins.

1565. *It is a sort that sticketh fast*, literally 'the kind is glued for the fixing on', where 'fixing on' is *transitive*. The metaphor is excluded from poetry in English, but this is accidental. **προσάψαι** is an explanatory infinitive. The word is from the same vocabulary as *κεκόλληται* itself. *γένος* is a variation for *γονά* (see previous verse), the words

<ἰὼ γᾶ γᾶ κτλ.>
ΚΛ. ἐς τόνδ' ἐνέβη ξὺν ἀληθείᾳ
χρησμόν, ἐγὼ δ' οὖν
ἐθέλω δαίμονι τῷ Πλεισθενιδᾶν
ὅρκους θεμένῃ τάδε μὲν στέργειν,
δύστλητά περ ὄνθ', ὃ δὲ λοιπόν, ἰόντ'
ἐκ τῶνδε δόμων ἄλλην γενεὰν
τρίβειν θανάτοις αὐθένταισιν.
κτεάνων τε μέρος
βαιὸν ἐχούσῃ πᾶν, ἀπόχρη 'μοὶ δ'
ἀλληλοφόνους
μανίας μελάθρων ἀφελούσῃ.

ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ.

ὦ φέγγος εὖφρον ἡμέρας δικηφόρου,
φαίην ἂν ἤδη νῦν βροτῶν τιμαόρους
θεοὺς ἄνωθεν γῆς ἐποπτεύειν ἄχη,
ἰδὼν ὑφαντοῖς ἐν πέπλοις Ἐρινύων
τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε κείμενον φίλως ἐμοί,
χερὸς πατρῴας ἐκτίνοντα μηχανάς.

1570. δύσπλητα.

---

being practically synonymous.—*πρὸς ἄτᾳ* Blomfield, 'the family (of the Atridae) is fastened (glued) to calamity'.

1566. **ἐς τόνδε** literally 'up to this man' *i.e.* Agamemnon, to whose corpse she points: he is the last at present in the fatal series (see *vv.* 1561—1565).—**ἐνέβη**: the subject is *δαίμων* 'the fate' or 'curse' of the family, expressed in the following clause.—**χρησμόν**: accusative of space with *ἐμβαίνειν walk in,* as a verb of motion; cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 989 *τήνδ' ἐμβαίνουσα κέλευθον, walking this way.* The *χρησμός* is the path which so far fate has *walked* or *trodden.* The prophecy of Calchas (*vv.* 153 foll.) traces events up to the death of Agamemnon and only so far; and the allusion may be to this or to some other like prophecy. It is not however necessary to suppose any prophecy more particular than the general sentence against the house. 'This', concedes the queen, 'has so far been fulfilled; let us hope that so far will be far enough'.—*ἐνέβης* Canter, *χρησμός* Casaubon.

1568. **Πλεισθενιδᾶν** and *Πλεισθένους γένος v.* 1602. The origin of this family name is uncertain.

1570. **δύστλητά** g.—**τάδε στέργειν,** 'that I submit to this (the past)', **ἰόντα τὸν δαίμονα**: 'and that he depart and vex' etc. The relation of the clauses would in later style be more exactly indicated; 'to say nothing of the past *if he will* now depart elsewhere'. The notion

O earth, earth, would that etc.

Cl. Up to this death it hath truly followed prophecy, but I now am ready to swear a compact with the Fortune of the house of Pleisthenes, that we accept, hard though it be, what is done, if henceforth he will leave this house, and harass with kin-murder some other race. A part of the wealth is not much to me who have it all, and moreover I am content if I but rid the palace of this internecine frenzy.

[*Enter* AEGISTHUS *with* Soldiers.]

Aegisthus. Hail, kindly dawn of the day that brings justice! This hour I will confess that from above earth gods look upon and avenge the woes of men, now that I see in a robe of the Furies' weaving this man lying as I would, and paying for what the hands of his father devised.

---

of such a bargain and the reasonable air of Clytaemnestra's proposal is of course but a ghastly jest.

1573—1576. **βαιόν** (ἐστι): 'is a little thing to give'.—Pursuing the figure of a bargain with fate, she declares herself ready to make sacrifices! If the departing δαίμων will take with him some of the εὐδαιμονία, he is welcome to take it; she can afford it *now*, and would besides readily spend something for the peace of this unfortunate house. Clytaemnestra not being herself of the Pelopid family is pleased to speak as one who has suffered much by connexion with it, and would gladly, even at some cost, have done with its boasted but unhappy genius. For the εὐδαιμονία of the Pelopidae see Eur. *Or.* 972 οἴχεται πρόπασα γέννα Πέλοπος ὅ τ' ἐπὶ μακαρίοις ζῆλος ὤν ποτ' οἴκοις, and so frequently.—**τε**...**δέ**: *not merely...but*: the substitution of δέ for τε in the second of two clauses, when τε has been promised, marks a rise or climax: see *Theb.* 571 and references there given.—**ἀπόχρη** is impersonal.—Difficulty has arisen here from want of punctuation. Supposing the four verses to be one sentence, Auratus changed τε in *v.* 1573 (as in that case would be proper) to δέ, and Canter struck out δέ in *v.* 1574. This makes *hiatus* (μοι | ἀλληλοφόνους) and accordingly Erfurdt rearranged the words thus, μανίας μελάθρων ἀλληλοφόνους. But in the supposed sentence κτεάνων μέρος βαιὸν ἐχούσῃ πᾶν ἀπόχρη μοι 'it suffices me to have a small part' the word πᾶν is superfluous (see Housman, *J. Ph.* XVI. 277). Nor is the sense suitable: Clytaemnestra does not offer, even in jest, to accept little: she only says with mock generosity that she would sacrifice something.—ἐχούσῃ πανεπαρκὲς ἔμοιγ'... Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XIV. 119, where see discussion.

1577. See the Introduction. The speech of Aegisthus sets forth (1) his claim or pretended claim to the throne (*vv.* 1585, 1605), (2) his hereditary feud with the dead king, (3) his own skill in directing the conspiracy.

1578. **ἤδη νῦν**, whereas hitherto οὐκ ἔφην. He has long vainly waited for justice. See *v.* 381.

1579. **γῆς** depends on **ἄνωθεν**: with **ἄχη** is to be supplied αὐτῶν, *i.e.* βροτῶν.

1580. **πέπλοις**: the ἀμφίβληστρον, standing as in *v.* 1495 for a type of the plot.—**'Ερινύων**: i.e. of just vengeance.

1581. **φίλως ἐμοί** 'in a way welcome to me'.

Ἀτρεὺς γὰρ ἄρχων τῆσδε γῆς, τούτου πατήρ,
πατέρα Θυέστην τὸν ἐμόν, ὡς τορῶς φράσαι,
αὐτοῦ τ' ἀδελφόν, ἀμφίλεκτος ὢν κράτει,
ἠνδρηλάτησεν ἐκ πόλεώς τε καὶ δόμων.
καὶ προστρόπαιος ἑστίας μολὼν πάλιν
τλήμων Θυέστης μοῖραν ηὗρετ' ἀσφαλῆ,
τὸ μὴ θανὼν πατρῷον αἱμάξαι πέδον.
αὐτοῦ ξένια δὲ τοῦδε δύσθεος πατὴρ
Ἀτρεύς, προθύμως μᾶλλον ἢ φίλως πατρὶ
τὠμῷ, κρεουργὸν ἦμαρ εὐθύμως ἄγειν
δοκῶν, παρέσχε δαῖτα παιδείων κρεῶν.
τὰ μὲν ποδήρη καὶ χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας
ἔθρυπτ' ἄνωθεν ἀνδρακὰς καθήμενος.†
ἄσημα δ' αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοίᾳ λαβὼν
ἔσθει βορὰν ἄσωτον, ὡς ὁρᾷς, γένει.
κἄπειτ' ἐπιγνοὺς ἔργον οὐ καταίσιον

1594. χρεῶν.

1585. **αὐτοῦ τε**: τε is irregular. Usage (as pointed out by Elmsley) requires in such a case either πατέρα τε... ἀδελφόν τε (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 406) or πατέρα...ἀδελφὸν δέ. But the inaccuracy may be the poet's own.—**ἀμφίλεκτος ὢν κράτει** *being questioned in his sovereignty*. For the quasi-local dative see *Theb.* 683. The more deadly offence of Thyestes (*v.* 1192) is suppressed by his son.

1586. **τε καὶ** *from his house and from the city as well.*

1588. **μοῖραν ηὗρετ' ἀσφαλῆ τὸ μὴ κτλ.** *found a partial safety so far as that he did not...*, literally 'obtained the saving of part'. For μοῖρα in its proper sense of *part* (μείρομαι, μέρος) see *Cho.* 237, *Theb.* 563, Eur. *Med.* 430.

1590. **αὐτοῦ ξένια** literally 'as an arrival-feast to (Thyestes) himself', accusative in apposition to the whole act following. The impiety of Atreus showed itself first in making the home-coming of his reconciled brother the pretended occasion for the abominable feast. **τοῦδε**: pointing to the corpse.—The close connexion of αὐτοῦ ξένια, and the separation of αὐτοῦ from τοῦδε, are made more plain to the hearer by the position of δέ.—It is possible also to join αὐτοῦ (*on the spot*) to the previous sentence.—For the metre of ξένια cf. *Cho.* 1 (Wecklein).—**προθύμως ...τὠμῷ**: lit. 'eagerly more than to my father welcomely'; φίλως as in *v.* 1581. The celebration of the feast was forced upon the suppliant, who had no motive for feigning this enthusiasm over the reconciliation, and regarded it rather with suspicion. Aeschylus is probably referring summarily to some known version of the story.—If προθύμως μᾶλλον ἢ φίλως be stopped off separately, the text cannot be defended. "*More zealous than friendly* is only possible as a joke, when applied to a man who under cover of a banquet murders his brother's children; and Aegisthus is not joking" (Sidgwick).—The assonance of προθύμως...εὐθύμως is intentional and pointed.

1594—97. Very uncertain. We have

For Atreus, ruling in Argos, this man's father, being questioned in his sovereignty by Thyestes, who was (to make all clear) father to me and brother to Atreus himself, banished him from his house and from the country also. And Thyestes, having returned as a suppliant to the hearth, found, unhappy man, safety so far, that his life-blood was not shed upon his father's floor. But taking the very occasion of his arrival, Atreus, the impious father of this slain man, pretending, with eagerness to my father little welcome, to hold a glad day of festival, served him a banquet of his children's flesh. Of the extremities, the foot-parts and fingered hands, he put a mince on the top, sitting down with tables apart (?). And not knowing it at the moment for what it was, he took of the meat disguised, and ate of a meal, which, as thou seest, his race have found unwholesome. And when he perceived the monstrous thing he had done, he shrieked and fell

---

no independent knowledge of the story followed by Aeschylus, and the words are obscure. The sense seems to be that Atreus made from the flesh of the extremities a broth, which being spread over (*ἄνωθεν*) the roasted bodies prevented Thyestes from recognizing them for what they were until he had eaten of the *θρύμματα*.—*ἄσημ'. ὁ δ'* (Dindorf for *ἄσημα δ'*) is perhaps right: *ἔσθει* as it stands should have for subject *Atreus*: but for a similar obscurity see *συνεξελαύνει* in *v.* 1606.—**ἀνδρακὰς καθήμενος** *viritim sedens* is strictly speaking a solecism; the word *ἀνδρακάς* *man by man, singly*, requires a plural subject, and the company, not the host, should be said *καθῆσθαι ἀνδρακάς*. On the other hand such expressions are not unknown where a single person has a representative character: thus we might say in English, 'One commander advanced in large divisions, the other in small', where the phrase *in large divisions* applies properly to the army. Similarly it is not impossible that a host should be said *καθῆσθαι ἀνδρακάς* with the meaning that his company sat so.—*ἄνευθεν ἀνδρακὰς καθημένων* *apart from the company seated singly* Wecklein (ed. 1887).—The object of mentioning the arrangement of the company (according to an archaic fashion) at separate small tables is to show how the fatal mess was safely served to Thyestes only: see the account of the similar feast of Harpagos in Herod. I. 119, and cf. Eur. *Iph. T.* 949 *ξένια μονοτράπεζα* (Wecklein).—**αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοίᾳ** best taken together, with emphasis on *αὐτῶν*, 'because he did not recognize *the actual bodies* at the moment'. Or *αὐτῶν* (without emphasis) may go with *λαβών*, 'taking *of them*'.—The adverb *αὐτίκα* belongs to the verbal substantive *ἀγνοίᾳ*.—I still think the text here not disprovable, and therefore give it under reserve. But there is much probability in the suggestion of Hermann, revived and amplified by Mr J. A. Platt (in *Class. Rev.* XI. 96), that Aeschylus followed a story similar to that of Seneca's *Thyestes*; Atreus cooked the bodies only and *kept the recognizable extremities, to prove what had been eaten*. In that case something is lost after *v.* 1594, and the passage must be otherwise injured.—Mr Brennan (*Class. Rev.* VII. 18) supports Casaubon's *καθημένοις*, joining it with *ἄσημα*.

ᾤμωξεν, ἀμπίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγὴν ἐρῶν,
μόρον δ' ἄφερτον Πελοπίδαις ἐπεύχεται,
λάκτισμα δείπνου ξυνδίκως τιθεὶς ἀρᾷ,
οὕτως ὀλέσθαι πᾶν τὸ Πλεισθένους γένος.
ἐκ τῶνδέ σοι πεσόντα τόνδ' ἰδεῖν πάρα.
κἀγὼ δίκαιος τοῦδε τοῦ φόνου ῥαφεύς·
τρίτον γὰρ ὄντα μ' ἐπίδικ' ἀθλίῳ πατρὶ
συνεξελαύνει τυτθὸν ὄντ' ἐν σπαργάνοις·
τραφέντα δ' αὖθις ἡ δίκη κατήγαγεν.
καὶ τοῦδε τἀνδρὸς ἡψάμην θυραῖος ὤν,
πᾶσαν ξυνάψας μηχανὴν δυσβουλίας.
οὕτω καλὸν δὴ καὶ τὸ κατθανεῖν ἐμοί,
ἰδόντα τοῦτον τῆς δίκης ἐν ἕρκεσιν.

ΧΟ. Αἴγισθ', ὑβρίζειν ἐν κακοῖσιν οὐ σέβω·
σὺ δ' ἄνδρα τόνδε φῂς ἑκὼν κατακτανεῖν,
μόνος δ' ἔποικτον τόνδε βουλεῦσαι φόνον;
οὔ φημ' ἀλύξειν ἐν δίκῃ τὸ σὸν κάρα
δημορριφεῖς, σάφ' ἴσθι, λευσίμους ἀράς.

1599. ἀν· πίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγῆς. 1605. ἐπὶ δέκ'.

1599. **ἀμπίπτει** Canter.—**ἀπὸ σφαγὴν ἐρῶν** (Auratus) *i.e.* ἀπερῶν σφαγήν, *disgorging the* (*sacrificial*) *meat.*

1601. "It is perhaps simplest to construe this 'spurning the banquet *to aid* his curse', *σύνδικος* being properly *one who pleads with you*, *an aider in the cause.* **συνδίκως** governs **ἀρᾷ**......The violent crash of the banquet was the symbol (**οὕτως**) of the invoked destruction of the family" (Sidgwick).—**οὕτως.** The analogy intended is more close than that of mere overthrowing. The death of Agamemnon has been achieved, like the outrage of Atreus, under the pretence of a sacrificial feast in honour of a home-coming. With the Homeric version (see the Introduction) the similarity would be even closer, since the feast of Aegisthus was properly *ξένια*. Probably when the Thyestean story was first grafted on to the legend, the *λάκτισμα δείπνου* also played a part in the revenge, being perhaps the signal for the treacherous assault.

1605. **ἐπίδικα...πατρὶ** *in satisfaction of my unhappy father's claim*, literally 'as what was liable to his claim'. In mockery of Thyestes' claim to share the royal inheritance (*v.* 1585) Atreus pretended to have discharged all obligations by sparing and banishing along with him the third child. If the Aeschylean legend agreed with the common version in giving to Pelops three sons (Atreus, Thyestes, Chrysippus), the parallel extends to *τρίτον*, *me, as his lawful third.* The word *ἐπίδικος* was specially applied to a disputed inheritance and (with *δίκαιος* in *v.* 1604 and *ἡ δίκη* in *v.* 1607) marks the point upon which Aegisthus naturally insists, that he is of the royal family and

back vomiting the sacrifice, and called a terrible doom on the house of Pelops, aiding his imprecation by the spurning of the banquet, that thus might perish all the race of Pleisthenes.

This is the cause which has laid this man where ye may see. And it is a justice that I am the maker of this murder. Me whom, for my miserable sire's 'just third', he sent, a swaddled babe, into exile along with him, that justice hath brought back again as a man. Even from beyond the border I reached my victim, contriving and combining the whole hard plan. And now I can even die with honour, having seen him in the toils of this just revenge.

Eld. Aegisthus, I care not to insult a wretch; but dost thou confess unasked to be this man's slayer, to be the sole contriver of this pitiable murder? I say that thou before justice wilt not escape, be sure, 'the people's dangerous imprecation' of stones.

---

represents a *legal* claim to the succession, the story of the 'banquet' being brought in chiefly *ad invidiam*. Aegisthus finds a proper answer to the cruel jest of Atreus in the fact that 'the child sent away with Thyestes as representing his right has now come back to avenge that right'.—The MS. ἐπὶ δέκ' (*thirteenth child*) is absurd, and without ἐπίδικα, or something of this kind, *vv.* 1604—1607 lack connexion.

1608. **ἡψάμην θυραῖος ὢν** *I have reached him from my exile*, literally 'while abroad'. He compliments himself upon the skill with which he has drawn together the threads of the conspiracy and 'contrived' the execution of it, under all the disadvantages of one who dared not openly appear in the country.

1611. **ἰδόντα**: for the acc. agreeing with με the supplied subject of κατθανεῖν, notwithstanding ἐμοί, see *P. V.* 234, Soph. *Ai.* 1006, Eur. *Med.* 814. (Sidgwick, Wecklein.)

1612. **ὑβρίζειν......σέβω, σὺ δὲ κτλ.** *Aegisthus—not that I care to triumph over the wretched,—dost thou* etc. They think, or try to think, not recognizing the full extent of their calamity and putting their own sense upon Aegisthus' talk of dying (*v.* 1610), that the murderer has run to his own destruction. At the same time they reflect obliquely upon the ὕβρις of Aegisthus himself.

1613. **φῂς ἑκὼν** *profess unasked*, 'volunteer the statement' in modern phrase. The use of φημί extends to admission as well as assertion; see *v.* 1578. They profess surprise that he should anticipate justice (ἐν δίκῃ *v.* 1615) by admitting complicity.

1616. *Imprecations which the people, trust me, shall hail on thee in shape of stones, i.e.* 'their curses which will doom thee to the death of stoning'. The point of this expression, and of the emphasis on the word δημορριφεῖς, lies in the contrast between these δημορριφεῖς ἀραί and the plot (also a δημορριφὴς ἀρά in a totally different sense of the words: see *vv.* 464 and 875), of which Aegisthus has just boasted. His language brings home to the elders, for the first time, the consciousness that the 'popular conspiracy', which they dreaded, has been in actual existence all this while, and that the murderers are supported by a powerful party. They still hope however that it may be outnumbered, a hope quickly dispelled by Aegisthus' contempt.

ΑΙ. σὺ ταῦτα φωνεῖς νερτέρᾳ προσήμενος
κώπῃ, κρατούντων τῶν ἐπὶ ζυγῷ δορός;
γνώσει γέρων ὢν ὡς διδάσκεσθαι βαρὺ
τῷ τηλικούτῳ σωφρονεῖν εἰρημένον.
δεσμῶν δὲ καὶ τὸ γῆρας αἵ τε νήστιδες
δύαι διδάσκειν ἐξοχώταται φρενῶν
ἰατρομάντεις. οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὁρῶν τάδε;
πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε, μὴ παίσας μογῇς.
ΧΟ. γύναι, σὺ τοὺς ἥκοντας ἐκ μάχης νέον
οἰκουρὸς εὐνὴν ἀνδρὸς αἰσχύνουσ' ἅμα—;
ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ τόνδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον.
ΑΙ. καὶ ταῦτα τἄπη κλαυμάτων ἀρχηγενῆ.
Ὀρφεῖ δὲ γλῶσσαν τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔχεις·
ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἦγε πάντ' ἀπὸ φθογγῆς χαρᾷ,
σὺ δ' ἐξορίνας ἠπίοις ὑλάγμασιν
ἄξει· κρατηθεὶς δ' ἡμερώτερος φανεῖ.
ΧΟ. ὡς δὴ σύ μοι τύραννος Ἀργείων ἔσει,
ὃς οὐκ, ἐπειδὴ τῷδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον,
δρᾶσαι τόδ' ἔργον οὐκ ἔτλης αὐτοκτόνως;
ΑΙ. τὸ γὰρ δολῶσαι πρὸς γυναικὸς ἦν σαφῶς·
ἐγὼ δ' ὕποπτος ἐχθρὸς ἦ παλαιγενής.
ἐκ τῶν δὲ τοῦδε χρημάτων πειράσομαι

1617. *νετέρᾳ.* 1621. *δεσμόν.* 1624. *πήσας.*
1637. *ἦ.* 1638. *τῶνδε.*

1617. **νερτέρᾳ.** The reading of f (*νετέρᾳ*) points perhaps to the form *νητέρᾳ* (*νειτέρᾳ*): cf. *νήιστα· ἔσχατα, κατώτατα*, Hesychius.—The two parties are compared to the *ζυγῖται* (rowers of the upper tier) and *θαλαμῖται* (lower tier) in a bireme ship (Klausen).

1619. **διδάσκεσθαι...σωφρονεῖν εἰρημένον** *to have impressed upon him the lesson of prudence*, literally 'to take teaching, when prudence is enjoined'. *εἰρημένον* is acc. absolute.

1621. **δεσμῶν...αἵ τε νήστιδες δύαι** *the pains of imprisonment and the pains of hunger.*—*δεσμὸς* (*Cod. Farn.*) does not well account for the reading of f (and g, and presumably therefore M), and would suggest that *τὸ γῆρας* is nominative.—**καὶ τὸ γῆρας...διδάσκειν** *to teach even that age.* The infinitive is explanatory, depending on *ἐξοχ. εἰσὶν ἰατρ.*

1623. *Doth not this sight warn thee?* literally 'dost thou not beware, seeing this?' a play on two senses of the word. —**τάδε** the whole scene.

1624. Cf. *P. V.* 339.—**παίσας** schol. on Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 173.

1625. The interrogative sentence **γύ-**

Aeg. Speakest thou so, thou, whose place is at the lower oar, while they of the deck are masters of the ship? Thine age will learn how grievous it is for one of thy years to be schooled in the dictate of prudence. Yet the pains of bonds and the pains of hunger are most surpassing mediciners to school the oldest mind. Doth not this sight warn thee? Kick not against the pricks, lest hitting thou hurt thyself.

Eld. Thou woman! Thou, who abodest at home, helping to defile a brave man's bed! To thee then shall warriors fresh returned from battle—? It is a captain of soldiers whose death thou hast thus 'contrived'.

Aeg. These words again will prove the fathers of weeping. Thy tongue is the opposite of Orpheus': for whereas he drew all things along with the joy of his voice, thy soothing bark will provoke, till thyself art drawn along. But once mastered thou wilt prove tamer.

Eld. And shall I think that thou shalt be despot of the Argives, who, being the 'contriver' of the king's death, didst not dare to do the deed of murder thyself?

Aeg. The part of deceit fell manifestly to the wife: I, as a hereditary foe, was open to be suspected. In the wealth of the

---

ναι...ἅμα—; which requires to complete it a verb such as *κρατήσεις* or *καταστρέψει*, is broken off in the violence of indignation, and the point of it is expressed in another shape. Similarly the translation requires the completion *yield* or *submit*: the change of form is made necessary by the order of words in an uninflected language.—**αἰσχύνουσα** participle of the imperfect.—**ἅμα**: with another *woman*, the wife.—The elders threaten the murderer with the vengeance of the veterans. But these are already slain or overpowered, which is part of Aegisthus' meaning in his reply.

1630. **ἀπὸ φθογγῆς χαρᾷ**: see *vv.* 1365, 1412 etc.

1631. **ἠπίοις** *soothing*, properly applicable to the music with which Orpheus tamed the beasts, is transferred to the *ὑλάγματα* in irony.—*νηπίοις* Jacob.

1632. **ἄξει**: *i.e.* *ἀπάξει*, passive, *wilt be haled* to prison.

1633. **ὡς δὴ...ἔσει** *thou forsooth shalt be* etc.: another elliptical phrase of indignation for '(do you mean forsooth) that you shall be?' This ellipse became fixed in the language and occurs also in Eur. *Andr.* 234, Soph. *O. C.* 809 (where see Jebb's note) and elsewhere.

1634. **ἐβούλευσας**: see *vv.* 1609, 1614, 1627. They harp in scorn upon his own language.

1635. **αὐτοκτόνως**: here 'as a sole murderer', a good example of freedom in the new application of compound words.

1637. **ἢ** Porson.

1638. *I.e.* he will apply the treasure and spoils of Agamemnon in payment of his hireling followers.—**ἐκ τῶν δὲ** Jacob.

ἄρχειν πολιτῶν· τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθάνορα
ζεύξω βαρείαις οὔτι μὴ σειραφόρον
κριθῶντα πῶλον· ἀλλ' ὁ δυσφιλὴς κότῳ
λιμὸς ξύνοικος μαλθακόν σφ' ἐπόψεται.

ΧΟ. τί δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ' ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς
οὐκ αὐτὸς ἠνάριζες, ἀλλὰ σὺν γυνή,
χώρας μίασμα καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων,
ἔκτειν'; Ὀρέστης ἆρά που βλέπει φάος,
ὅπως κατελθὼν δεῦρο πρευμενεῖ τύχῃ
ἀμφοῖν γένηται τοῖνδε παγκρατὴς φονεύς;

ΑΙ. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δοκεῖς τάδ' ἔρδειν καὶ λέγειν, γνώσει τάχα.

ΛΟΧ. εἶα δή, φίλοι λοχῖται, τοὔργον οὐχ ἑκὰς τόδε.

ΑΙ. εἶα δή, ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπιζέτω.

ΧΟ. ἀλλὰ μὴν κἀγὼ πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν.

ΛΟΧ. δεχομένοις λέγεις θανεῖν σε· τὴν τύχην δ' αἱρούμεθα.

ΚΛ. μηδαμῶς, ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, ἄλλα δράσωμεν κακά.

1652. κἀγὼ μήν. 1653. ἐρούμεθα.

1640. **ζεύξω βαρείαις** (ζεύγλαις). Similar ellipses are πληγῆναι πολλὰς (πληγάς), γνῶναι τὴν νικῶσαν (γνώμην). — **οὔτι μὴ...κριθῶντα** *not, be assured, with high feeding, like a horse for the trace.* The horse which ran with a separate trace (σειραφόρος) is contrasted with those driven under the yoke. The strength of the trace-horse was of great importance at the turns of the chariot-race: hence κριθῶντα (Wecklein).—The appearance of irregularity in this sentence (οὐ μή or οὔτι μή being properly constructed with finite verbs, subj. or future indicative) is an appearance only. In reality the negative applies by relation to the verb ζεύξω.—οὔτι μὴν Karsten.

1641. **ὁ δυσφιλὴς κότῳ λιμὸς ξύνοικος** *hunger that will not dwell at peace with rage,* literally 'hunger, that is to rage ill-friendly as a housemate', so called because where hunger comes rage is 'turned out of doors', or in plain words the angry spirit is tamed.—δυσφιλεῖ σκότῳ Scaliger.

1643. The haste, with which Aegisthus drops the topic of his part in the exploit and falls back upon threats (*vv.* 1636—42), shows that, notwithstanding his plausible reply, he is sensitive to the taunt of cowardice and care for his own safety. Accordingly his enemies instantly urge it again.

1644. **αὐτὸς**: by thyself, *alone.*—**σὺν** *with thee.* For the separate adverbial preposition see *vv.* 591, 1270, 1358. *Why must his wife join with thee in the murder?*—There is no error here: it is the cue of the speakers to treat Aegisthus as primarily responsible, according to his own declaration. The reading has been suspected only from the misrepresentation of the plot, which gives Aegisthus no part to play and thus obscures the meaning not only of these lines but of the whole scene. See the Introduction.

dead man I shall seek the means of control. On the disobedient subject I shall lay a heavy yoke, and give him, I warrant you, less than a tracer's provender. Yes, hunger, which doth not mate peaceably with wrath, shall not leave him till he is mild.

Eld. Why then of thy cowardice didst thou not butcher the victim alone? Why, to the defilement of our country and our country's gods, join the wife with thee in the murder? Oh, doth Orestes haply live, that by grace of fortune he may return to this land, and slay this pair victoriously?

Aeg. Nay then, if thou wilt so say and do, thou shalt have a lesson at once!

A Soldier of Aegisthus. Come on, comrades! Our work is not far off now.

Aeg. Come on! Make ready! Draw every man his sword!

Eld. Nay, I too, sword in hand, am prepared to die.

Soldier. 'To die!' An acceptable word! We take the moment.

Cl. Nay, dearest, let us do no more ill. What is done is

1645. **χώρας...ἐγχωρίων** in apposition to the notion τὸ τὴν γυναῖκα κτεῖναι.

1649—53. There is some uncertainty here as to the distribution of the parts. The tradition, as originally given by f, divides them thus: 1649 *Aeg.*, 1650 *Cho.*, 1651 *Aeg.*, 1652 *Aeg.*, 1653 *Cho.* At 1651 the mark is corrected to *Cho.* and the arrangement so corrected agrees with g and h. The arrangement now generally prevalent gives 1649—50 and 1652 to Aegisthus, 1651 and 1653 to the elders; some further suppose that a verse is lost before 1650. The difficulty has arisen, I believe, from the fact that there are really not two parties, as commonly supposed, but three, Aegisthus, the elders, and the λοχῖται (mercenary guards) of Aegisthus. One of these λοχῖται speaks. The distribution above given is to be understood thus: seeing the turn which the altercation is taking one of Aegisthus' impatient troop (1650) exclaims with joy to his comrades that they will not have to wait much longer. At Aegisthus' order (1651) they draw their swords, whereupon the elders and the few who are with them draw also and prepare to sell their lives dearly (οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν). The others eagerly accept their defiance and are at the point to fall on when Clytaemnestra interferes.—For ancient evidence supporting this view see Appendix III.

1649. **γνώσει τάχα** 'thou shalt have an *immediate* lesson', contrasted with the long discipline of imprisonment. The emphasis is on τάχα.

1652. **μὴν κἀγὼ** Porson.

1653. **αἱρούμεθα** Auratus. **δεχομένοις** and **τὴν τύχην αἱρούμεθα** mean the same thing, that they accept the favourable omen of the others' despair.

1654. The motive of Clytaemnestra in this interference, in spite of her edifying piety, is not scruple or mercy, but interest. It is essential to the tyrants that the elders should remain prisoners and hostages, and therefore that they should not be killed. As to liberating them, there is no question of it. See on *vv.* 1656, 1659.

ἀλλὰ καὶ τάδ' ἐξαμῆσαι πολλά, δύστηνον θέρος.
πημονῆς δ' ἅλις γ' ὕπαρχε· μηδὲν αἱματώμεθα.
†στείχετε δ' οἱ γέροντες πρὸς δόμους πεπρωμένους τούσδε,
πρὶν παθεῖν ἔρξαντες καιρόν· χρῆν τάδ' ὡς ἐπράξαμεν.†
εἰ δέ τοι μόχθων γένοιτο τῶνδ' ἅλις γ', ἐχοίμεθ' ἄν,
δαίμονος χηλῇ βαρείᾳ δυστυχῶς πεπληγμένοι.
ὧδ' ἔχει λόγος γυναικός, εἴ τις ἀξιοῖ μαθεῖν.
ΑΙ. ἀλλ' τούσδε μοι ματαίαν γλῶσσαν ὧδ' ἀπανθίσαι
κἀκβαλεῖν ἔπη τοιαῦτα δαίμονος πειρωμένους.
†σώφρονος γνώμης δ' ἁμαρτῆτον κρατοῦντα.
ΧΟ. οὐκ ἂν Ἀργείων τόδ' εἴη, φῶτα προσσαίνειν κακόν.
ΑΙ. ἀλλ' ἐγώ σ' ἐν ὑστέραισιν ἡμέραις μέτειμ' ἔτι.
ΧΟ. οὔκ, ἐὰν δαίμων Ὀρέστην δεῦρ' ἀπευθύνῃ μολεῖν.
ΑΙ. οἶδ' ἐγὼ φεύγοντας ἄνδρας ἐλπίδας σιτουμένους.
ΧΟ. πρᾶσσε, πιαίνου, μιαίνων τὴν δίκην· ἐπεὶ πάρα.
ΑΙ. ἴσθι μοι δώσων ἄποινα τῆσδε μωρίας χάριν.

1655. ὁ ἔρως. 1663. δαίμονας.

1655. "The order of the words points to taking **πολλὰ** as predicate, *Even these are many to reap, a bitter harvest.* The commoner rendering *Even to reap these many woes is a bitter harvest* is possible, but would rather require *τοσαῦτα.*" Sidgwick.—**θέρος** Schütz.

1656. **πημονῆς δ' ἅλις γ' ὕπαρχε** *let punishment at least begin with what is enough: let us shed no blood,* literally 'as to punishment, make beginning of it at all events to a *sufficient* extent'. **πημονῆς** *pain* but with the secondary suggestion of punishment (cf. our *pains and penalties*), as in *P. V.* 601 *ἐνέζευξας ἁμαρτοῦσαν ἐν πημοναῖς* and in that play frequently. For the construction of the genitive with *ὑπάρχειν* see L. and Sc. *s.v.* — The disciplinary imprisonment, which Aegisthus has promised, may prove sufficient to subdue rebellion, so that to inflict death would be premature. The point is put still more clearly in *v.* 1659.—*ὑπάρχει* Scaliger.

1657—58 are beyond restoration: *ἔρξαντα* g, h: M probably had *ἔρξαντας*, as Mr Housman infers, but it is doubtful even whether this *ἔρξαντας*, or the word which it represents, is from *ἔρδω*, *ῥέζω* or from *εἴργω*. The general sense may be *στείχετ' ἤδη τοὺς γέροντας πρὸς δόμους πεπρωμένους | πρὶν παθεῖν ἔρξοντες· ἀρκεῖν χρῆν τάδ' ὡς ἐπράξαμεν*, 'go at once and take them to prison before they come to harm; we should have been content with what was done', an order addressed to her attendants and spoken as if she would gladly save the elders from their own folly. The expression **δόμους πεπρωμένους** *destined dwelling-place* is perhaps not inapplicable to a prison. All however is uncertain.

much to reap, a bitter harvest. Begin pain with enough; but let us have no bloodshed. Go ye at once and confine these old men to their destined dwelling-place before they come to harm (?). With our work, as it was accomplished, we should have been content (?). And if we should find that enough has been inflicted, there we will stop, sore smitten as we have been by the heavy heel of fate. This is a woman's lesson, if any deigns to learn.

Aeg. And must they thus flaunt the folly of their tongues against me, and tempt fate with a fling of such high words?

Cl. (?) And when they lose their senses, must he who is master of them do the like?

Eld. It is not the way in Argos to fawn upon a villain!

Aeg. Well, I will come up with thee one of these days yet.

Eld. Not if heaven guide Orestes back to the land.

Aeg. I know myself how exiles feed upon hopes.

Eld. Go on, make thee fat, and befoul the good cause, as thou canst.

Aeg. Be sure thou shalt make me amends for this kind insolence!

1659. *And if we find that this suffering has gone far enough, we will stay our hand*, literally 'if of these sufferings there should prove to have been *enough*' (γε throws the emphasis upon ἅλις), if, that is, confinement and starvation produce submission.—**μόχθων**. This word like πημονή is applied in the *Prometheus* repeatedly to the punishment of the hero.—**ἐχοίμεθ' ἄν** '*we will refrain* or *stop* and inflict no more'. For this sense of the verb see examples in L. and Sc. *s.v.* C, iv.—δεχοίμεθ' Martin.

1660. *Smitten as we have been by the grievous spur of fate.* She speaks of the murders already done as an unhappy necessity.—**χηλῇ**. Wecklein compares *Pers.* 518 ὦ δυσπόνητε δαῖμον ὡς ἄγαν βαρὺς | ποδοῖν ἐνήλλου παντὶ Περσικῷ γένει.

1662. **ματαίαν γλῶσσαν...ἀπανθίσαι** *flaunt the folly of their tongues*, literally 'make a foolish tongue break out in bloom'. Cf. R. Browning, *Caliban upon Setebos*, 'letting the rank tongue blossom into speech'. This, rather than 'cull the flower' of the tongue, is the sense which the context suggests.—The infinitive is the exclamatory infinitive of indignation.

1663. **δαίμονος** Casaubon.

1664. If **δ'** is correct, the verse is not a continuation of the foregoing, which would require either καί or τε. Perhaps therefore it should be given to Clytaemnestra and written thus, σώφρονος γνώμης δ' ἁμαρτῇ τὸν κρατοῦνθ' ἁμαρτάνειν, literally 'But that he who is master of them should lose his senses along with them!' *i.e.* 'If they are foolish, need you therefore let yourself be provoked into the folly of killing them?' The assonance of ἁμαρτῇ...ἁμαρτάνειν is in the poet's manner, and on the other hand ἁμαρτάνειν might drop off as a supposed double reading.

1665. Aegisthus is with difficulty restrained from putting the elders to death, and they are led away, answering with

ΧΟ. *κόμπασον θαρσῶν, ἀλέκτωρ ὥστε θηλείας πέλας.*
ΚΛ. *μὴ προτιμήσῃς ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων·* ἐγὼ
καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων καλῶς.

1671. *ὥσπερ.* 1672—3. Omits *ἐγὼ* and *καλῶς*.

---

defiant taunts his threats of executing his purpose another time.

1670. **τῆσδε μωρίας χάριν** a periphrasis for *τῆσδε μωρίας*, but not quite synonymous with it. It has an ironical force, as in English we might say, 'I will *thank* you another time for these insults'.

Eld. Brag, brag with boldness, like a cock beside his hen!

Cl. Care not for this idle barking. I and thou will make good order, masters we of this house.

1671. **ὥστε** Scaliger.

1672. **προτιμήσῃς...ὑλαγμάτων**: for the loose construction, imitating that of *φροντίζειν*, is cited Eur. *Alc.* 761.

ib. *ἐγώ, φησί, καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντες τῶνδε τῶν δωμάτων διαθησόμεθα τὰ καθ' αὑτοὺς καλῶς* schol., whence the words *ἐγὼ* and *καλῶς* are supplied in the text (Canter, Auratus).

APPENDIX I.

A.

v. 2. κοιμώμενος
στέγαις Ἀτρειδῶν ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην.

Two interpretations have been suggested: (1), reading στέγης and taking ἄγκαθεν for ἀνέκαθεν, *sleeping above* (*on?*) *the roof.* A gloss in Hesychius shows that this interpretation is ancient. But ἄγκαθεν is not a legitimate contraction for ἀνέκαθεν, nor does ἀνέκαθεν mean *on*, but *above* or *from above.* This therefore is generally abandoned.

(2), *couched on the roof, resting dog-like upon my arm* (Hermann). This is provisionally accepted; but (*a*) the use of the dative is dubious; there is nothing in κοιμώμενος to determine the dative (which in itself signifies merely relation of some kind) to the meaning *on*: κοιμώμενος στέγαις, if the dative were taken as quasi-local, should mean *sleeping in the house*, as στέγαις δέχεσθαι (Eur. *Or.* 46) means *to receive in the house, under* (not *on*) *the roof*, and σῴζεσθαι στέγαις (Eur. *Hec.* 1014) *to be kept in the house*: (*b*) ἄγκαθεν does not mean *on the arm* but *in the arms*: ἀγκά-ς, ἄγκα-θεν, ἀγκά-λη etc. are regularly used of the *inside* of the bent arm, and to describe the act of embracing (see Aesch. *Eum.* 80). Hermann, to forestall this objection, points out that ἀγκώ-ν means both the hollow and the angle of the arm. But the difference of stem is not immaterial. Moreover here κοιμώμενος itself suggests that ἄγκαθεν has its proper sense: κοιμᾶσθαι γυναικὶ ἄγκαθεν and βρέφος μητρὶ ἄγκαθεν κεκοίμητο would be natural and regular expressions in the language of poetry for *the babe was sleeping in its mother's arms*, etc., the datives being common datives of relation: (*c*) a man could hardly describe himself as having lain in a certain posture *for a year.*

The words κοιμώμενος στέγαις ἄγκαθεν can, I believe, mean nothing but κοιμώμενος στεγῶν ἐν ἀγκάλαις *lulled in the embrace of the roof.* Is

this a conceivable expression? For this speaker and in this situation I think it is. In the *Prometheus* (1049) Hermes says to the hero

> φάραγγα βροντῇ καὶ κεραυνίᾳ φλογὶ
> πατὴρ σπαράξει τήνδε, καὶ κρύψει δέμας
> τὸ σόν, πετραία δ' ἀγκάλη σε βαστάσει,

comparing the sufferer ironically to a child carried softly in the arms. If the sentinel were represented lying in an angle of sloping roofs (and no position would be more natural) he might well describe himself, with an irony like that of Hermes but differing as the persons differ, as 'cradled in the roof's embrace'. The metaphor is not more strong than κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις cited from some poet (probably Aeschylus) by Aristophanes (*Ran.* 704). The words κυνὸς δίκην do not affect the question. There is no need to join them specially with κοιμώμενος... ἄγκαθεν: and they may mean no more than that the man is made to pass the night, like a watch-dog, in the open air.

B.

vv. 49—51. τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν οἵτ' ἐκπατίοις
ἄλγεσι παίδων, ὕπατοι λεχέων,
στροφοδινοῦνται κτλ.

Like vultures, who, vexed by boys in the supreme solitudes where they nest, wheel round and round, etc.

All the commentaries on this passage start from the assumption that παίδων means the 'children', that is, the 'young' of the birds. I think this doubtful: παῖς *prima facie* does not mean 'offspring' but 'a young human being'; the word meaning 'offspring', and as such common to men and beasts, is τέκνον (see Aesch. *Theb.* 278 etc.), and the distinction is supported by many examples from every kind of poetry. Apparent exceptions (at least in writers whose usage may properly be supposed to illustrate the instinct of Aeschylus) either prove nothing to the point or prove the strength of the rule. Thus in Aesch. *Pers.* 580 fish are called ἄναυδοι παῖδες τᾶς ἀμιάντου, which of course proves nothing. The nightingale is παιδολέτωρ (*Rhes.* 549), because she is *Philomela*, mourning for her *son*: Medea (Eur. *Med.* 1407) is παιδοφόνος λέαινα. These are for the rule. In Eur. *Ion* 175 the birds are commanded μὴ παιδουργεῖν in the temple, an expression proper to the human relation being borrowed for decency and to avoid a coarser term. How naturally human, to the ear of Aeschylus, was the word παῖς is shown by *Ag.* 722,

where the lion-whelp is εὐφιλόπαις: the epithet would be unintelligible, if there could be any doubt that παῖς means a human being.

Doubtless the human word might be transferred to animals, *if the context disproved the ordinary interpretation and compelled the other*; but there is nothing in the present passage to exclude the ordinary meaning; on the contrary, the purpose of the simile naturally requires the mention of the offenders; and indeed without this, how does it appear that the young birds are *stolen*? The words πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες, which have suggested the other rendering, come too late to preclude the natural and *prima facie* interpretation of παίδων. We must take then παίδων in its proper sense for the *boys*, who rob the nest, answering to the ἀγρόται, not to the τέκνα, of the Homeric simile which Aeschylus is imitating (cited by Bochart, Hermann etc.) κλαῖόν τε λιγέως ἀδινώτερον ἤ τ' οἰωνοί, φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες, οἷσί τε τέκνα ἀγρόται ἐξείλοντο, πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι (*Od.* 16. 216). The genitive will then be that of the subject or origin, and ἄλγεσι παίδων will be literally 'in grief from boys'.

For ἐκπάτιος the old interpretation of Hesychius, ἐκπάτιον· τὸ ἔξω πάτου, 'that which is solitary, away from the haunts of man', is correct. The word πάτος *tread* seems to have gone out of use in its primary sense as early as Homer, who has it several times in the same restricted meaning *haunt of man*, as opposed to solitary places, such as hills and deserts. Thus Poseidon (*Il.* 20. 137) invites the gods to retire ἐκ πάτου ἐς σκοπίην, and Bellerophon wanders in the Aleian plain, ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων (*Il.* 6. 202). Here the word applies properly to the birds themselves[1], but is transferred to their feelings (ἄλγη) by a usage in which Greek poetry is peculiarly bold. The present case is little if at all more different from our habit of language than *e.g.* Soph. *Ant.* 794 νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον, for 'a strife between kinsmen'. The epithet is to the point; it is an aggravation of the complaint that the robbers are also invaders.

So far I do not find any difficulty. But there remains a real difficulty in ὕπατοι λεχέων, commonly rendered 'high above their nest'. Mr Housman (*J. Ph.* XVI. 247) justly rejects this. "The learner of Greek, in quest of probable or even plausible reasons for believing that ὕπατοι λεχέων *summi cubilium* means ὑπὲρ λεχέων *super cubilia*, is dismissed to these references 'ἐσχάτη χθονός *Prom.* 865, ὑστάτου νεώς *Suppl.* 697, ὕπατος χώρας Ζεύς *Ag.* 492'. The first two of these passages πόλις ἐσχάτη χθονός and οἴακος ὑστάτου νεώς prove to him

[1] Or perhaps to the boys, truants out of their own place, as suggested by Prof. Campbell (*Class. Rev.* IV. 301), who however adheres to the usual view of παίδων.

what he could well believe without proof, that such a phrase as θριγκὸς ὕπατος τείχους *a coping which is the highest part of a wall* is Greek; but since vultures on the wing are not the highest part of their eyries the information does not help him. Had he been referred, say, to a passage where a fish following a ship is called ὕστατος νεώς, then he would have been helped; but Greek literature contains no such passage: such a fish is ὕστερος νεώς". The third reference, meaning properly 'Zeus highest *in* the land' and therefore 'supreme over' it, makes for the same argument. I think it unanswerable, and conclude that if ὕπατοι λεχέων be taken with στροφοδινοῦνται it is unintelligible. Mr Housman concludes that it is altogether unintelligible; but this I do not yet accept.

If ὕπατοι λεχέων is correct, the genitive must, as Mr Housman says, be of the partitive kind. But why not? No one would demur to Ὠρώπιοι ναίουσιν (or εἰσὶν) ἔσχατοι τῆς Βοιωτίας, or to a description of the Athena of the Acropolis as ἡ ὑπάτη οὖσα ἱερῶν *she whose sanctuary is highest*, literally *she who is highest among sanctuaries*, the name of the people or the goddess standing for the place of abode. On such analogy, I submit, is formed ὕπατοι λεχέων, literally *highest of nests* (not *of their nests*), for *nesting highest* of all birds. And this reinforces the point marked by ἐκπατίοις, that the injured parents are invaded in their own solitudes. A prose writer, if in prose such an expression could have been used at all, would have written ὕπατοι ὄντες λεχέων: but it is equally certain that Aeschylus would not insert the participle; his style abounds in these participial adjectives (*e.g.* *Ag.* 58).

I should translate then literally, 'who, in grief among-the-solitudes inflicted-by-boys, being-highest-nested, wheel round and round with stroke of their wings' etc., to which the paraphrase above given comes as near as our language permits.

τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν οἵ τ' ἐκπάγλοις | ἄλγεσι παίδων ὑπατηλεχέων | στροφοδινοῦνται κτλ. (Dr Headlam, *Class. Rev.* XIV. 113) is unexceptionable, if the tradition must be rejected, as most assume. But I find it difficult to believe that the adjective ἐκπάτιος (ἐκπάγλοις Blomfield) has been brought into this context by a blunder.

C.

vv. 125—129. κεδνὸς δὲ στρατόμαντις ἰδὼν δύο λήμασι δισσοὺς
Ἀτρεΐδας μαχίμους ἐδάη λαγοδαίτας
πομπούς τ' ἀρχάς.

From the difference (δύο[1]) which Calchas saw between the royal brothers, he perceived that they were typified by the two different eagles, and that the appearance was ominous. The writer of λήμασι conceived the difference to lie in the *tempers* of the princes, Agamemnon being conspicuously brave, Menelaus μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής (*Il.* 17. 588, cited by Plato *Symp.* 174 C). The eagle with white feathers in the tail and wings was commonly called πύγαργος (Schol. on *v.* 117 ὁ ἐξοπίσω λευκός, ὅ ἐστιν ὁ πύγαργος), and the word, whether because this species though larger than others was not so strong or for other reasons, was applied to *cowards*: πύγαργος εἶδος ἀετοῦ. Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ δειλοῦ. ἀπὸ τῆς λευκῆς πυγῆς (Soph. *fr.* 692 A). Cf. the proverb 'showing the white feather', and see L. and Sc. *s.v.* πύγαργος.

Such is the ancient and traditional explanation, but it is far from satisfactory. For *first* Menelaus was not generally recognized as a coward or unwarlike and does not so figure in the extant *Epos*, though the dramatists, and perhaps some of their predecessors, invented for variety a cowardly Menelaus, similar to their mean Odysseus. In our Homer he is βοὴν ἀγαθός and his prowess is frequently celebrated. Plato, who requires for the sake of a jest to suppose him unwarlike, makes the most of a single expression divorced from the context, which shows it to be a mere insinuation made for the purpose of the moment. In this very passage of Aeschylus the epithet μαχίμους forbids such a conception. *Secondly* if the fact were so, it would be strange that Calchas should imply such an ignominy in the presence of Menelaus and his army. *Thirdly* ἰδών points to *visible* difference. *Fourthly* part of the present symbol, or at least something closely resembling it, is found in Sophocles (*Ant.* 113) with an explanation. There 'the eagle with snow-white wings' stands for the *Argives* distinguished by their white shields. Note also that in the passage before us not only does the word πύγαργος not occur, but there is nothing definitely referring to the tail at all. The words are 'white-marked at the back'.

Putting this together, we may well believe that the difference which

[1] Dr Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XIV. 114) points out that δύο is predicate ('*twain* by tempers') and δισσοὺς epithet ('the two'), not *vice versa* as commonly taken, arguing rightly from the order of the words.

Calchas 'saw' was not in the characters of the brothers, but in *the shields slung upon their backs*, and consequently that λήμασι is a false correction of some word unknown. These considerations or some of them led Haupt to propose λέμμασι and Pleitner σήμασι. But no known or credible meaning of λέμμα will fit, and it is not the *emblems* (σήματα) of the shields to which we are directed by the passage in Sophocles, but their colours. Certainty in such a matter is impossible, but a word which would fit all the conditions is the derivative, whatever it should be, not of λα- but of λιφ- *to paint*—λίμμα, ἄλιμμα, λεῖμμα, or ἄλειμμα. That this stem (like the Latin *lin-ere*) originally had this sense is shown by the use of ἀλείφειν (μίλτῳ, ψιμυθίῳ etc., see L. and Sc. *s.v.*): δύο λίμμασι *different in their tincts* gives the sense we should seek. Critically it is little less probable than λήμασι itself. The type of error is common (see *e.g. Ag.* 867).

D.

vv. 146—149. τόσσων περ εὔφρων, καλά,
δρόσοισιν ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν ἐόντων
πάντων τ' ἀγρονόμων φιλομάστοις
θηρῶν ὀβρίκαλοισι τερπνά, κτλ.

Kind as thou art, fair goddess, to the uncouth offspring of the many creatures fierce, as well as sweet unto the suckling young of all kinds that range the field, etc.—μαλερῶν ἐόντων (θηρῶν) literally 'of fierce creatures, though they are fierce'. For the use of the form ἐών in the lyrics of tragedy cf. Eur. *Andr.* 124 ἀμφὶ λέκτρων διδύμων ἐπίκοινον ἐοῦσαν. The reference to *fierce* animals is, strictly speaking, irrelevant, as the sympathy of the goddess had been evoked, in the case of which Calchas is speaking, by *hares*. But the suggestion, that her universal love (note τόσσων, πάντων) extends to the savage kinds as well as the rest, is very much to his present purpose, which is to persuade her not to involve in the punishment of the Atridae the hapless Iphigenia, and to propitiate her on behalf of the 'house of the *eagles*'.

I have ventured to write ἐόντων for ὄντων (M), and not λεόντων, in spite of the testimony that λεόντων was actually an ancient reading. The objection to λεόντων is mainly critical.

In the first place λεόντων is inconsistent with τόσσων. But further, if the original reading was δρόσοισιν ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν λεόντων, it is hard to account for the reading of M, δρόσοισιν ἀέλπτοις μαλερῶν ὄντων, descended, as the scholium suggests, from a MS. which had ἀέπτοις. No editor would invent, except upon some supposed evi-

dence, a reading so absurd as δρόσοισιν ἀέλπτοις, and none would be likely to mistake a word so common as λεόντων. On the other hand, if ἐόντων was the original, the history is simple. To the line as it originally stood were appended two marginal notes, ὄντων and λείπει τὸ λ, the first explaining ἐόντων, the second on the contrary proposing the correction of it given by the *Etym. Mag.*, λεόντων. The two notes indicated in fact the two ancient opinions about the reading. The scribe of M, or some preceding scribe, took the gloss ὄντων as a correction into the text: as the note λείπει τὸ λ had so lost its application, he or some other *put the* λ *into the wrong word*, thus manufacturing ἀέλπτοις. The existence of the reading λεόντων is perfectly well accounted for as a slip of memory. The quotations of the ancients are even more inaccurate than those of the present day; nothing would be more likely than that a writer, who was concerned only with the use of δρόσος, should be misled by μαλερῶν into the false quotation of the etymologist.

It may be added that *lions* have nothing to do with the matter, either directly or indirectly.

E.

vv. 183—185. Ζῆνα δέ τις προφρόνως ἐπινίκια κλᾴζων
τεύξεται φρενῶν τοπάν.

MS. κλάζων...τὸ πᾶν.

Scholia. 184 ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι νίκης. 185 ὁλοσχερῶς φρόνιμος ἔσται.

The general meaning here is clear, 'trust in Zeus will not be misplaced, his strength is invincible'. Upon the words three questions arise:—(1) as to the sense of προφρόνως, (2) as to the reading κλάζων, (3) as to the reading τὸ πᾶν. It will be convenient to take (3) first.

In a paper in the *Journal of Philology*, Vol. IX., it was pointed out that the existence and use of the words τοπάζω, ὑποτοπέω, ἄτοπος and others, warranted, under the general laws of Greek formation, the assumption that there also existed the corresponding words τοπή (or τοπά) and τόπος *a conjecture, guess*, and τοπάω *to guess*, a parallel form to τοπάζω: that these words are very liable to be confused with others: and that they should be borne in mind in interpreting our MSS., especially those of the tragedians. These positions, in their general and *a priori* bearing, have not, so far as I know, been disputed; and are approved by (among others) Mr A. Sidgwick[1]. In the paper

[1] See his edition of the *Agamemnon*, App. II. 'The *a priori* probability' etc.

mentioned were collected the passages which seemed to require consideration from this point of view, among them *vv.* 185, 687, 982 of this play, each exhibiting the ambiguous letters τοπαν. Mr Sidgwick prefers τὸ πᾶν in each and, as will be seen from my text, I agree with him as to the two last, though as to *v.* 687 with much hesitation. In the present passage I believe that τὸ πᾶν cannot be interpreted, and that τοπάν is right. Mr Sidgwick (with modern editors generally) accepts the explanation of the scholia, and translates 'shall find wisdom altogether'. But the sense put upon τεύξεται φρενῶν cannot be got from the words. Φρένες (or φρήν) does not mean 'wisdom', it means *a mind*: φρένας ἔχειν is not 'to be wise' but *to have a consciousness* or *be conscious*, as in the address of Philoctetes to his bow (Soph. *Phil.* 1130) ἦ που ἐλεινὸν ὁρᾷς, φρένας εἴ τινας ἔχεις, κτλ.: φρενῶν ἐπήβολος is a synonym not of σοφός but of ἔννους and means *possessed of his intellect*, marking the difference between the man and the infant (*P. V.* 460): φρενῶν κενός (Soph. *Ant.* 754), ἀποσφαλείς (Aesch. *P.V.* 488), ἁμαρτάνει (Eur. *Alc.* 327), are all, as the context will show, very strong expressions, importing the absence or loss not of *wisdom* but of sense or the faculty of thought. The exact expression τυγχάνειν φρενῶν I cannot find, and am not surprised, for in its proper sense it would require a very peculiar context to justify it: the nearest approach is Soph. *El.* 992, εἰ φρενῶν | ἐτύγχαν' αὕτη μὴ κακῶν, ἐσῴζετ' ἂν | τὴν εὐλάβειαν, *had she been blessed with a mind not mischievous*, where the qualification μὴ κακῶν would be needless and injurious, if τυγχάνειν φρενῶν could bear the meaning assumed for the present passage. Abundant evidence, positive and negative, goes to show that τεύξεται φρενῶν τὸ πᾶν could mean only 'will find wits' or 'will be blessed with a mind altogether', and therefore for the present purpose has not a meaning at all. On the other hand τεύξεται φρενῶν τοπάν *will be right in the guess of his thought* is simple, and has a special fitness here from its correlation with the preceding passage (προσεικάσαι *v.* 173) and, as will be immediately shown, with the words προφρόνως ἐπινίκια.

Next as to προφρόνως:—πρόφρων, literally 'forward-minded' or 'fore-minded', means elsewhere *willing* or *zealous*. But ancient tradition was right in saying that here the poet has used προφρόνως so as to suggest the meaning (equally admitted by the form of the word) *fore-casting, prophetically, by anticipation*. That this was the ancient tradition is shown by the note in the scholia 'in *expectation* of his victory', which has nothing to go upon except προφρόνως thus interpreted. The difference is very small, in substance indeed none, but the purpose of the poet is indicated by the antithesis of *fore* and

after in προφρόνως-ἐπινίκια (properly 'such as follow a victory'), and by the correspondence between προφρόνως and φρενῶν τοπάν. Such development of latent capacity in a word is the very essence of poetical expression, and here saves the word προφρόνως from being flat and superfluous. The point of the whole passage and of this sentence is that Zeus' power is supreme and his triumphs therefore certain beforehand. The certainty of an event cannot be put more strongly than by saying, that 'he who guesses it will be so will be right'. Whether πρόφρων was often used by the poets in this sense, we are not in a position to say, nor is it material. The prevalence of another sense is no argument to the contrary, as may be seen from many other compounds, *e.g.* πρόδικος, πρόγονος, προεῖδον, προεῖπον, προγίγνομαι, προδίδωμι, all of which have various meanings.

Lastly as to the reading κλάζων ἐπινίκια *singing songs of victory* or κλᾴζων (the quasi-Doric equivalent for κληΐζων) ἐπινίκια *giving titles of victory*. The MS. offers the choice, for the presence or absence of the *iota subscript* is nothing. My reasons for preferring κλᾴζων are (1) that *the name* of Zeus is the topic of the passage (*v.* 170) and the significance of that name has already been hinted (see *v.* 175 and the reference given above); (2) that κλάζω, which applies properly to harsh discordant sounds, such as the screaming of birds (*v.* 48), always, even in its looser applications, signifies the quality or tone of the sound, as deep or harsh or repellent or terrible or the like (see *vv.* 165, 211), whereas here no such suggestion can be intended. The only apparent cases I can find to support the view that κλάζων could mean merely *to sing* are Soph. *Trach.* 206, and Eur. *Ion* 905. But in the first there is an antithesis between the treble voices of women and ἀρσένων κλαγγά the *masculine bass*; and in the second the terms κιθάρᾳ κλάζεις, addressed to Apollo, are purposely offensive (see the context) and suggest a comparison between the 'song' of the cruel god and the 'screams' of a bird of prey.

F.

v. 288. ἐπίανεν.

Dr Headlam, defending the derivation of this word from πιαίνω, writes as follows (*On editing Aeschylus*, p. 34).

"The metaphorical uses of πιαίνω may be studied from the following:—

Lycophr. *Alex.* 1200 οὐδ' ἐπίανεν βορᾷ νηδύν (so Babrius CVII).

Xenophanes 2. 22 οὐ γὰρ πιαίνει ταῦτα μυχοὺς πόλεως (cf. Hesych. πιῆναι: ὠφελῆσαι, αὐξῆσαι).

Agathias *A.P.* v. 294 μάστακα πιαίνων χείλεος εὐαφίῃ.

Opp. *Hal.* v. 372 ἑὴν φρένα πιαίνοντες.

Opp. *Hal.* v. 620 πιαίνων ἐς ἄεθλα λιγυφθόγγου μέλος αὐδῆς.

Pind. *P.* II. 55 βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσι πιαινόμενον.

Themist. *Or.* VII. 90 D θρήνων ἐρῶντες καὶ στεναγμῶν, οἰμωγῆς ἀκορεῖς, δάκρυσι πιαινόμενοι.

Lex. Seguer. ἐκ τῶν Φρυνίχου (Anecd. Bekker, p. 51) λόγοις πιαίνειν: οἷον παραμυθεῖσθαι".

The reader will consider whether these examples are parallel to the supposed use of πιαίνω by Aeschylus here. To me they appear essentially different, all natural, or easily derivable from the primitive sense *to fatten*, as the other is not. I would not however deny that the use attributed to Aeschylus is conceivable. The question is not this, but whether it is preferable in probability to the alternative supposition that we have here the compound ἐπ-ιαίνω, which, as Blomfield remarks, 'fits the sense excellently'. Why should this compound be rejected or suspected because it does not occur elsewhere? Many verbs, and very many compounds, are now represented by single examples. Why not this one?

I take this opportunity of acknowledging generally my debt to Dr Headlam's pamphlet, which has suggested many corrections (one for example in the note here) beside those which are acknowledged specially.

G.

v. 313. πλέον καίουσα τῶν εἰρημένων.

Weil's translation is preferable. The alternative 'raising a fire larger than those before mentioned' is prosaic and inappropriate. The beacon on Cithaeron, which has the smallest distance of all to light, cannot be meant to be represented as larger than that of Athos, which was to 'pass the wide main'. But that it should be 'greater than was commanded' is natural enough.

It may be thought that there is a particular intention in this compliment paid to the enthusiasm shown upon the occasion of the triumph of Hellas over Asia by 'the watchers upon Cithaeron'. On the north slope of Cithaeron, the side to which the message came, lay the little town of Plataea, the whole of whose fighting force, unsolicited and

alone, came over the mountain to join the Athenian army just before the battle of Marathon, while all the other Greek cities delayed and made excuses. This service, which produced the deepest impression upon the Athenians and was constantly commemorated in their public prayers, cannot, I think, have been forgotten by the writer or any Athenian hearer of these lines. For the facts and an eloquent commentary upon them see Grote, *Hist. Greece*, Part II., Chap. 36. From this point of view the text is more than defensible, and the alternative reading to be next mentioned derives no support from any difficulty in the MS.

προσαιθρίζουσα πόμπιμον φλόγα.

Raising to the skies a missive flame. These words are cited, without name of author, by Hesychius. It was proposed by Dindorf to place them here after *φρουρά*, and though not so pointed and apposite as the MS. reading, they fit the place with an exactness surprising if accidental. On the whole it seems probable that the quotation of Hesychius really is a very ancient reading of this passage, and it is possible that both readings descend from the poet himself.

H.

v. 326. *νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.*

But the winner is he who ran first and last. Two questions arise here: (1) What did this expression mean as commonly understood, in reference to an ordinary torch-race? and (2) What is the point of it here? Why, and in what sense, is it specially applicable (as it must be, or it would not be introduced) to the metaphorical 'torch-race', the chain of beacons?

The answer to the latter question is obvious. In this *pretended* *λαμπαδηφορία* of beacons 'the victory is won', *i.e.* the queen's design is accomplished, 'by the runner who ran first and last', or in other words, by the only one who 'ran' at all, the beacon upon Arachnaeus. It is a piece of 'irony', signifying to those in her confidence (and to the audience acquainted with the story) that in this case the 'head of the chain' is the whole chain.

The first question has been variously answered, but all suggestions (except that mentioned below) may be reduced to two heads: (1) 'the victory is won by the first and last runners', *i.e.* by the runners from first to last, by the whole chain: and (2) 'by the first runner, who is also the last' or 'although he is the last', *i.e.* by the runner who comes in sooner than the final runner of any other chain (and in this sense *first*) though he is the *last to run* in his own chain.

But a view, simpler at least and less artificial than these, has recently been propounded by Professor Phillimore (*Classical Review* XVII. 105).

"In analysing word for word we may break up some organic unit of phrase.... Such...there is in the words πρῶτος—καὶ—τελευταῖος.

(1) Herod. IX. 28 τελευταῖοι δὲ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἀθηναῖοι ἐτάσσοντο in the order of battle at Plataea; (2) Xen. *Memor.* Γ I. 8 (*cf. also* 9); (3) Charito *Chaereas and Callirrhoe*, I. 5 (p. 419 in Didot's *Erotici*): Χαιρέας δ' ἔτι τῷ θυμῷ ζέων δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς ἀποκλείσας ἑαυτὸν ἐβασάνιζε τὰς θεραπαινίδας, πρώτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἅβράν.

In (1) it means *on the extreme wing*; in (2) [the same]; in (3) apparently, by a metaphor, *as a prime and final test*" [or perhaps simply *first and chiefly*]. "From which I conclude that...the phrase characterizes the nearest-to-Argos of the chain of λαμπαδηφόροι; and (doubtfully) that Clytaemnestra's meaning is ....*and the winner in the race is my first-hand watchman, the fugleman of the array on whom all depends*".

If this is right, the popular meaning, as commonly applied to a λαμπαδηφορία, will be that the 'head and end' of the chain, he who runs in, is the most important man and has the most brilliant place, a remark natural to the *Graii laudis avari*, and suiting well with the special intention here.

I.

vv. 357—359. θεοῖς δ' ἀναμπλάκητος εἰ μόλοι στρατός,
ἐγρηγορὸς τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὀλωλότων
γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ πρόσπαια μὴ τύχοι κακά.

So this passage has commonly been punctuated. Those who retain it, as for example Mr Sidgwick, interpret it thus: "'But if the army returned without such offence to the gods, the woe of the dead might yet wake, if sudden ills did not befall'. The second 'if' is a repetition of the first in other words...'if they kept free of such offence (and accordingly) if no...sudden judgment befell'". The sense of this is, I conceive, right, and the accumulation of parallel hypothetic clauses is not in itself objectionable. But where, as here, the clauses are separated, the result is great obscurity. And there are other objections. It does not appear why the judgment of the gods should be distinguished from the Nemesis of the dead as necessarily 'sudden'; either danger might fall at once or fall later.

Of emendations, the majority have for object to get rid of the negative in ἀναμπλάκητος, the earliest being apparently Canter's θεοῖς δ' οὐκ ἀναμπλάκητος, the simplest that of Pauw θεοῖς δ' ἂν ἀμπλάκητος (a word however not unimpeachable), and the best ἐναμπλάκητος (adopted by Dindorf). The sense would then be, 'if the army return having offended the gods, the woe of the dead may wake, though no sudden mischief should occur'. But this is still unsatisfactory. The last clause still comes too late, as an awkward afterthought, and its relation to the whole is still difficult to perceive.

Dr Headlam (*Class. Rev.* XII. 245) rejects the general assumption that an emphasis can be thrown upon τῶν ὀλωλότων. Without a stop there, the objection has force; but the final word in a Greek sentence can and often does receive emphasis, though often it has none. He would throw the sole emphasis on some word (to be substituted for ἐγρήγορον) signifying *harmless* or *assuageable*.

J.

v. 363. ΧΟ. β'. γύναι, κατ' ἄνδρα σώφρον' εὐφρόνως λέγεις.
ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας πιστά σου τεκμήρια
θεοὺς προσειπεῖν εὖ παρασκευάζομαι· κτλ.

Here for the first time a question presents itself, which will occur several times hereafter in the play. What is the character of the speaker?

It is commonly assumed that every speaker, who is not one of the principal actors, is one of the elders, by whom are sung the great odes of the play. But there is no ground for assuming this. In the *Eumenides* certainly, in the *Choephori* perhaps, there is not one Chorus only, but two. And in the *Agamemnon* the assumption that there is only one Chorus and only one class of χορευταί makes great and hopeless difficulties.

Here we have two speeches, neither of which can be assigned to any of the principal actors, separated by a speech from Clytaemnestra (*vv.* 329—366). The attitude of the two speakers towards the subject before them is not merely different but diametrically opposed. The first speaker (*v.* 329) treats the queen's proffered 'proof' of the Greek victory with a reserve which is barely saved from discourtesy. He declines to act upon it at once, and requests that the amazing story may be repeated again 'in full detail'. His behaviour is in fact distinguished from the open incredulity of the speakers at the close of

the following ode (*v.* 481) only by such a decent disguise as the queen's presence necessarily commands.

On the other hand the second speaker, he of the lines now before us, is entirely satisfied with the queen and her statement. Contradicting the other almost in his own terms, he says that after the sure proofs which he has heard 'he for his part (ἐγώ) will thank the gods for the victory', which is exactly what the first declines to do, till he has heard something more.

Now if these two speakers are the same person (or persons in like situation) what explains this change of mind? What has Clytaemnestra said to satisfy his curiosity and remove his hesitation? He asked for a repetition, with details, of the statement about the beacons. The queen has not taken the least notice of his request. Her reflexions may or may not be very laudable and wise, but what have they to do with the 'evidence' of the victory?

I am by no means the first to notice these difficulties, though they have been little considered. Thus on *v.* 331 Dr Wecklein says, that the speaker 'desires a repetition, a wish which Clytaemnestra satisfies to this extent, that she gives in *v.* 332, Τροίαν Ἀχαιοὶ τῇδ' ἔχουσ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, the substance of the beacon-message, and appends to it reflexions' etc. If the speaker is content with this measure of satisfaction, he might surely have spared his request. The question which Clytaemnestra has professed to answer in the foregoing description of the beacons is the question of *v.* 292, 'What messenger could possibly come so quick?' Here is the 'amazing' circumstance which provokes further enquiry. And the queen satisfies this enquiry by stating that the victory is this day won?

It would be hard, I think, for two speeches to offer stronger internal evidence that they do not proceed from the same lips, than is contained in the two before us. We shall not look far for external confirmation.

It is plain that the second speaker, whoever he is, is also the singer, or one of the singers, of the hymn in anapaestic march-time which immediately follows. He proposes to praise the gods for the victory, and he does so accordingly. But are these the singers of the following strophic ode? If so, what is the meaning of the first line of that ode (*v.* 379)?

Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσ' ἀνειπεῖν.

'Tis a stroke of Zeus which they are able to proclaim. The MS. (f) has ἔχουσαν εἰπεῖν with the word ἔχουσαν corrected to ἔχουσ'. It seems certain that ἔχουσ' ἀνειπεῖν is the tradition thus represented. Yet the suggested emendations ἔχεις ἀνειπεῖν (Schmidt), ἔχοις ἂν εἰπεῖν (Karsten),

ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν (*Cod. Farn.*, *i.e.* Triclinius) etc., and the forced explanation of this last, Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν, by 'they (the Trojans) have the blow of Zeus to tell of'—all these are testimonies to the impossibility, upon the current assumption as to the course of the preceding scene, of reading and translating the verse in this obvious way.

But give up the attempt to assign all the speaking and singing to the same persons, and there is no difficulty. The queen comes naturally not unattended; and from the course of the play both before and afterwards it is evident (as is shown in the Introduction) that by this time there have gathered about her many of those who are in her secret. It is they who here interfere to rescue her from an embarrassing and dangerous situation. She has partly missed her effect. Those who are to be deceived have found her story more wonderful than convincing. They believe her to be the victim of a delusion (*v.* 489) and have shown a desire to press enquiries impossible to satisfy and perilous to elude. Her accomplices take up the cue and, to cover her escape, play the required part of plain citizens, who feel none of these doubts. They admire her wisdom and good feeling. They think her evidence certain. They will offer thanks to heaven accordingly. While they perform this mockery, the queen retires, and the elders are left to act as they may.

They act as might be expected, so as, if possible, not to commit themselves in any event. To the victory which the others 'can proclaim', they refer in brief, vague, and carefully guarded terms (*vv.* 379—381). Then glancing off into generalities they pursue the reflexions with which they are themselves pre-occupied, the miserable cause for which the war has been waged, the sufferings which it has caused, and the menacing discontents which are the result of those sufferings.

It then occurs to them (*v.* 481) that the news of the victory, unproved as it is, must be spreading; and in the vexation of this thought their disbelief breaks out openly, whereupon (see *v.* 595) this new turn is reported within by their observant enemies. What they might have done next we do not discover, for at this moment the herald appears and the situation is completely changed.

As to MS. authority on the distribution of these speeches, there is none. The MS. (following probably M itself) assigns *vv.* 363—366 to a certain ἄγγελος, first introduced in M as the speaker of *vv.* 270—275. The modern editors have properly dismissed this personage to limbo. The fact is that the company commonly assigned to the *Agamemnon* does not provide characters enough for this scene and others. The designation XO. for *v.* 363 is correct, though not complete. I have

distinguished the accomplices of Clytaemnestra (who here both speak and sing) by the designation XO. β′.

K.

vv. 417 foll. πολὺ δ' ἀνέστενον
τόδ' ἐννέποντες δόμων προφῆται·
'ἰὼ ἰὼ δῶμα δῶμα καὶ πρόμοι,
ἰὼ λέχος καὶ στίβοι φιλάνορες·
πάρεστι σιγᾶς ἄτιμος ἀλοίδορος,
ἄδιστος ἀφεμένων ἰδεῖν.'

I am almost unwilling to vex these lines, beautiful even in the doubt and obscurity which rest upon them, with any further attempt at exact interpretation. Whether it is worth while to do so must depend on the view we take as to the nature of the responsion in metre between strophe and antistrophe used by Aeschylus. If the last two verses originally corresponded syllable by syllable to *vv.* 437—8,

τὸ πᾶν δ' ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος αἴας συνορμένοις
πένθει' ἀτλησικάρδιος κτλ.

the accidental injury must be greater than we can repair. By writing Ἕλλανος (Bamberger) in *v.* 437 and σιγὰς ἀτίμους ἀλοιδόρους (Hermann) in *v.* 421 we may make these verses correspond with changes singly slight but not really probable. The case of *v.* 422 is still harder: ἄπιστος ἐμφανῶν ἰδεῖν (Margoliouth), *not believing what is before his eyes*, though not beyond suspicion in point of grammar, is a very striking suggestion and the best made: but it is too far from the tradition to be trusted.

But since I hold, for reasons explained in the Appendix to my edition of the *Septem* and in Appendix II. to this, that, as far as the metre is concerned, both strophe and antistrophe may be right as they stand, and as I see no reason to doubt the sense of the antistrophe, I think it worth while to consider further the sense of this.

The first question is, Who are the speakers, the δόμων προφῆται? Opinion was divided between 'the seers of Menelaus' house' and 'the seers of Priam's house,' till it was pointed out independently by Bamberger, H. L. Ahrens, and Housman that προφήτης does not mean *a seer*, but *one who interprets* or *speaks on behalf of* some one either named or implied in the context[1], and that προφῆται δόμων must mean

[1] *Theb.* 596 is no exception to this. The context sufficiently suggests the genitive θεῶν.

'those who interpreted the house' or something of this kind. The 'interpreters of the house' then, it is said, will be those who at the time of the flight of Helen represented the scene in the house of Menelaus to the elders, who would not otherwise know of it, 'purveyors of gossip about the royal family' (Housman). It is however difficult to believe that a word closely associated with supernatural powers would be applied, without explanation, to such a function as this, even if we assume that the elders would have required 'a revealer' or 'interpreter', being themselves, it would seem, as likely as any one to have had the king's confidence. I must hold therefore that the meaning of *δόμων προφῆται* is still to seek.

In truth this appears to be one of those passages, which, from the loss of knowledge, familiar at the time of writing, about the terms used and the story told, cannot, except by guess-work, be explained at all. From the way in which *δόμων προφήτης* is here used it would seem to have had some fixed conventional significance, connected, as the general use of *προφήτης* would indicate, with divination. For instance, a person, who professed to report or communicate to one absent from home what was said in the house which he had quitted, might not unnaturally be called *δόμων προφήτης*, being an intermediary between the enquirer and his house, as the *προφήτης θεοῦ* between the enquirer and the god. If we may further suggest that such services were used by women, when they quitted one *δόμος* for another upon *marriage*, we should account for the mention of the *προφῆται* here; for the bitter comparison of the rape to a marriage is pursued in this play repeatedly and in this very passage (*v.* 415). The 'home-interpreters' will then be the seers who at Troy revealed to Helen and Paris what was passing at Argos, sighing, in spite of their intention to mock, at the suffering which they could see. The elders put into their mouths what they know to have been the facts. The picture (whether this be the true account of it or no) was probably based upon some scene existing in literature, by reference to which it could be understood and completed.

Now as to *vv.* 421—422. One thing I consider certain, that *ἄδιστος ἀφεμένων ἰδεῖν*, by whomsoever written, was not written accidentally but deliberately. The nominative to *πάρεστι* is of course *ἀνήρ*, *the husband*, supplied from *φιλάνορες*. *'Αφίεσθαι γυναῖκα* (see L. and Sc. *s. v.*) is '*to put away* a wife', and *οἱ ἀφέμενοι* therefore in this context means Menelaus, by whom Helen, in the language of the robbers' irony, has been *dismissed* or *divorced*. Take this with the use of *ἥδιστος* in Soph. *Ai.* 105 *ἥδιστος, ὦ δέσποινα, δεσμώτης ἔσω θακεῖ*, *He sits*, *my most delightful prisoner*, *within*, and we see that *πάρεστιν ἄδιστος ἀφεμένων*

ἰδεῖν is an appropriate and idiomatic description of Menelaus, as the Trojans might describe him in mockery of his rage and grief. Precisely as in the *Aias*, ἥδιστος describes the object of a malicious joy. Such words were never thrown casually together by a blundering pen. They were written either by the poet or by some learned and cunning editor, making poetry for Aeschylus after a conception of his own. I believe they were written by the poet. They represent the feelings which the προφῆται δόμων, speaking to the taste of their Trojan auditors, desired to express, sharply contrasted with the pathos, which they felt in their own despite. The words σιγᾶς ἄτιμος ἀλοίδορος (if they may mean 'unregarded, unscolded on the part of the silence', *i.e.* 'with none to answer his contemned invectives') are conceived in the same spirit[1]: and the ambiguity of ἰώ, expressing either triumph or grief, is also adapted to the purpose. See also the note on *v.* 431.

We might translate the whole then somewhat thus: *And oft they sighed, the interpreters of the home, as they said: 'Ah, for the home! Aha, for the home! Aha! and ah! for the princes thereof! for the husband's bed yet printed with her embrace! There he stands, his curses mocked with silence, the parted spouse, the sweetest sight of them all!'*

L.

v. 438. *πένθεια.*

If πένθεια is a word (and we are not entitled to assume that it was not, merely because we do not easily recognize its origin and meaning), it should be a feminine of the type of βασίλεια, ἱέρεια etc. There is no reason why it should not be this, and from the context and other evidence we can fairly infer its meaning. We have a suitable stem in that of πενθ-ερός, connected according to the etymologists with the English *bind*, and signifying at all events the idea of *connexion* or *relationship*. The termination -ευς (feminine -ειᾰ) is also proper to a word of this class, as in ἀγχιστεύς (*a kinsman*), γονεύς, etc. Thus formed, πένθεια (with a presumable ancient masculine πενθεύς) would mean *kinswoman*, strictly perhaps 'connexion *by affinity*', but likely to be so used as to include either kinship or connexion generally. Now this fits the context well. It is the *women* left behind, the mothers, wives, sisters, daughters of the absent men, who are most naturally taken as types of the anxiety at home; nor is there difficulty in the use

[1] To render ἀλοίδορος *unreproachful* is scarcely in accordance with the use of λοιδορία, λοιδορεῖν.

of the person for the class, 'the kinswoman' for 'the kinswomen'. And to this πένθεια the genitive δόμων 'kinswoman of the house' attaches itself naturally. I would therefore retain the text, with the interpretation, 'heavy in each house must be the hearts of the women-folk'. Another trace of this archaic group of words may be found in Πενθεύς. Proper names in Greek (*e.g.* Medon *ruler*, Mnestor *wooer* etc.) are often words gone out of common use. It is not to be supposed that the name of *Pentheus* was given with consciousness of the evil significance found in it by fate (ἐνδυστυχῆσαι τοὔνομ' ἐπιτήδειος εἶ Eur. *Bacch.* 510): this intention would take all the point out of the coincidence. The name of 'kinsman' is happier and more likely.

For proposed corrections see Wecklein. None is satisfactory, and indeed if πένθεια be given up, there is no sufficient foundation.

M.

vv. 498 foll. κῆρυκ' ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τόνδ' ὁρῶ κατάσκιον
κλάδοις ἐλαίας· μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι κάσις
πηλοῦ ξύνουρος διψία κόνις τάδε,
ὡς οὔτ' ἄναυδος οὔτε σοι δαίων φλόγα
ὕλης ὀρείας σημανεῖ καπνῷ πυρός,
ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ χαίρειν μᾶλλον ἐκβάξει λέγων κτλ.

On the difficulty of this passage and of current interpretations I have spoken above. The only remedy proposed by way of correction (see Wecklein) is to read in *v.* 501 ὃς (Stanley) or ὃ δ' (Keck) for ὡς. It is easy to see why this has not been found satisfactory. It makes sense of the second clause, 'who (or 'he') will give us the news better than by beacons', but only to raise another question—What then is τάδε in *v.* 500? What does the dust testify? But a wholly new suggestion has been made by Mr Housman (*Journal of Philology* XVI. 264), which deserves to be stated in full:

The coryphaeus catching sight of the herald sees also in the distance a cloud of dust which he supposes to be raised by the returning army; and the return of the army means something decisive, either victory or defeat. The crew of Agamemnon's ship, if Aeschylus followed Homer, would be 120 men; and these together with an ἁμαξήρης θρόνος for Agamemnon and Cassandra, would raise in clear dry southern air a cloud of dust to be seen a great way off. No doubt to us the allusion seems obscurely worded; but I fancy the Attic audience recognized an old friend. Of the plays of Aeschylus only a tithe has come down to us, but in that tithe we find *Supp.* 186 ὁρῶ κόνιν, ἄναυδον ἄγγελον στρατοῦ, and *Sept.* 79 μεθεῖται στρατὸς στρατόπεδον λιπών | ...αἰθερία κόνις με πείθει φανεῖσ' | ἄναυδος σαφὴς ἔτυμος ἄγγελος. It may be guessed that by the time the

poet wrote this play—three years before his death—he had so familiarised his hearers with the conception of κόνις as an ἄγγελος στρατοῦ that he could dispense with an explicit reminder. The addition κάσις πηλοῦ ξύνουρος is mere ornament, like the αἰόλην πυρὸς κάσιν of *Sept.* 481.

Now it will, I think, be admitted that this explanation, in referring the 'dust' to the approach of the king and his company, offers a conception intelligible and natural, if we can fairly find it in the words. The difficulties which Mr Housman leaves are those which he has himself perceived. First, although it is probable enough that the notion of 'dust' as 'announcing' the approach of a large body was familiar to the audience of Aeschylus[1], we still feel the want here of some indication that the dust is actually seen in the distant landscape. Secondly, we are still without light upon κάσις πηλοῦ ξύνουρος διψία. Mr Housman justifies this as mere ornament by the traditional reference to *Sept.* 481. But the parallel will not bear examination. To describe the red smoke which proceeds from the mouth of a fire-breathing monster as 'smoke akin to fire' is ornament indeed, and appropriate ornament. But is it equally appropriate, is it ornamental at all, to describe the dust-cloud raised by men marching as *thirsty dust, sister and neighbour to mire*? *Thirsty*, though not very suitable to dust in the air, might pass as a mere epithet of dryness, but *sister and neighbour to mire* gives just the suggestions which are not appropriate. Here then are the points to which we should direct our attention.

Considering so, it will occur to us that the obscurest point of all, so far, is the word ξύνουρος. I have used above the common rendering 'neighbour'. But ξύνουρος really means *conterminous*, *bordering upon*, *marching with*, and is applied to contiguous territories or other figures of space. Now if we should grant that dust, as such, whether on clothes or in the air or wheresoever, might be called *akin to mire*, as being a thing of the same class (?), yet why should these kinsmen be contiguous? The idea of 'dust contiguous to mud' is simple enough; the dust of a road, for example, is 'contiguous' to the mud of the ditch: but dust in the air is not contiguous to mud, nor is dust in general. In short, to have a satisfactory sense, the description πηλοῦ ξύνουρος κόνις must be not metaphorical at all, but local.

Now the speakers are looking out towards the sea over Argolis, a land so notorious for its dryness as to have been named from Homeric times *The Thirsty* (πολυδίψιον Ἄργος, cf. Ἄργους διψία χθών Eur. *Alc.* 563). The streams are scanty and in the summer fail entirely, so that

[1] Some confirmatory evidence as to this will be found in my edition of the *Septem*, Appendix II.

the Argives had a legend that Poseidon, defeated in a contest with Athena for the possession of the land, avenged himself by cutting off the water (Pausanias 2. 15. 5). For this reason in the *Supplices* (784) the swarthy fugitives from Egypt, who have found refuge in Argolis, seeing that their pursuers are near, call upon the land to hide them, and wish that they might themselves be turned into dust and mix indistinguishably with the black clouds which are sweeping over the downs. In reference therefore to the plain of Argos the description διψία κόνις is not merely appropriate, but almost sufficient of itself in the circumstances to suggest the local use. But this dust is 'sister to the mire, contiguous to him'. Why so? Here is the more exact description of the plain of Argos: "The eastern side is much higher than the western; and the former suffers as much from a deficiency as the latter does from a superabundance of water. A recent traveller (Mure) says that the streams in the eastern part of the plain are all drunk up by the thirsty soil, on quitting their rocky beds for the deep arable land......The western part of the plain, on the contrary, is watered by a large number of streams, and at the south-western extremity near the sea there is besides a large number of copious springs, which make this part of the country *a marsh or morass* (the marsh of Lerna)......In the time of Aristotle this part of the plain was well-drained and fertile, but at the present day it is again covered with marshes' (Mure, abridged in Smith's *Dictionary of Geography* I. p. 200). A glance at the map will show the situation; and see also the account in Pausanias (2. 36. 6—7) of the journey from Argos to Lerna. Now the mud or ooze of watery land, of the Egyptian Delta for instance, is called among other things πηλός (see L. and Sc. *s. v.*). From these facts and the evidence of the context here it is a reasonable conclusion that *the brother and sister whose lands lie side by side, the Dust and the Mire*, is simply an ancient and traditional description of *Argolis*, parched in its eastern part, drenched in its western. The speakers are looking eastwards towards the sea, across the waterless region; and it is therefore the Sister, the Dust, which tells them that a large body of men is approaching from the port. Even if the conception of dust announcing an army was not, as it is likely to have been, an Aeschylean commonplace, the local description is quite sufficient to show what is meant, especially if interpreted, as on the stage, by the gestures of the actors. On seeing the herald they naturally look out over the country to see what comes behind. The sight of the dust assures them that he is followed by a crowd, and that his news therefore must be important and is probably decisive. As we have seen in the Introduction, the

party with the king would be large, consisting not only of his own soldiers and companions, but of those who had gone to meet him and bring him as rapidly as possible to the fortress. This indication that they are now in sight is important to the plot. The critical situation created by the arrival of the herald could not possibly have been maintained for any great length of time.

See on the foregoing Prof. Campbell, *Class. Rev.* IV. 302.

N.

vv. 578—584. ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖσιν Ἀργείων στρατοῦ
νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρέπει.
ὡς κομπάσαι τῷδ' εἰκὸς ἡλίου φάει
ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης καὶ χθονὸς ποτωμένοις,
'Τροίην ἑλόντες δήποτ' Ἀργείων στόλος
θεοῖς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα
δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν ἀρχαῖον γάνος'.

The difficulty in *vv.* 580—581 is well known, and perhaps cannot be solved with certainty on the present materials. The points to observe are these: (1) the κόμπος or κόμπασμα is to be made throughout future time, as is shown by the expressions δήποτε and ἀρχαῖον, which would only become applicable long after. To such a case as this the use of an anticipatory (proleptic) predicate does not fairly extend, as the λάφυρα did not become an ἀρχαῖον γάνος by being nailed to the temples. It is natural that, in making the most of the triumph, the man should speak of eternal, not of immediate, fame. This indicates that it is the sun, and not any human person, who is the agent and herald of the κόμπασμα, as the grammar itself also suggests: for (2) the order of the words in *v.* 580 favours decidedly the close connexion of τῷδε...ἡλίου φάει with εἰκός.

Another construction is indeed possible: we may take τῷδε φάει with κομπάσαι, either as temporal or as object (*boast to the sun*, doubtful Greek but conceivable), and make ἡμῖν, supplied from *v.* 578, depend on εἰκός. So it appears to be taken by all who retain the text, *e.g.* Paley "The sense is 'the Argives, as they joyfully speed on their way, may boast of having fixed up Trojan arms' etc."

But those who reject this (Weil, Wecklein and others) are in my opinion so far right; for (i) the usual construction after εἰκός ἐστι is the accusative (not the dative) and infinitive, and in the accusative (ἡμᾶς) the pronoun, if the subject of κομπάσαι, would naturally be

thought; ποτωμένους therefore (Stanley) not ποτωμένοις would have been written, especially as the accusative would have been free from ambiguity; and (ii) to speak of an army or of messengers as '*flying* over land and sea', in the sense of 'moving rapidly', is not according to the habit of Greek metaphor. At least I can find nothing like it.

Of the suggestions made on the assumption that the text is unsound, the most probable is that of Merkel, that after *v.* 580 a verse is lost by which ποτωμένοις was explained. Against all the mere corrections (such as ποτωμένῳ Heath, τάδε...ποτώμενα Weil) there is this general objection, that they do not account for the reading we find. If the text is not sound, though I believe it is, we had better suppose a lacuna.

O.

v. 655. ξυνώμοσαν γάρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρίν,
πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα, καὶ τὰ πίστ' ἐδειξάτην
φθείροντε τὸν δύστηνον Ἀργείων στρατόν.

As to the primary meaning of these lines there is no difficulty. The only question to be raised is whether we are to look beyond this. It will be recognized as suitable to the genius of Greek tragedy that one who is unconsciously in imminent danger should unconsciously use expressions signifying his danger to the audience better informed. I believe that Aeschylus has here sought that effect. 'A conspiracy', says the man, 'was made between utter foes, πῦρ and θάλασσα, and for pledge of their league they destroyed the hapless army of Argos'. Now the speaker himself and the remnant that has returned are about to be ensnared, and some if not all of them to be slain, by 'a conspiracy[1] between two that had been utter foes', Clytaemnestra, that is, and Aegisthus, the hereditary enemy of Agamemnon's house. If then the parts of these two conspirators are properly symbolized by πῦρ and θάλασσα, the coincidence is not likely to be accidental.

Of the πῦρ it is unnecessary to say more. More than half of this play is occupied with the part which, under the direction of Aegisthus, 'the fire' contributes to the plot by which Agamemnon fell. It remains then to ask whether θάλασσα is in like manner a symbol of the part contributed by Clytaemnestra.

[1] Cf. *Cho.* 976 ξυνώμοσαν μὲν θάνατον ἀθλίῳ πατρὶ | καὶ ξυνθανεῖσθαι· καὶ τάδ' εὐόρκως ἔχει, an allusion to details in the foregoing history which we have now no means of tracing. See note there; the doubtful reading does not affect the present question.

Now if we read the strange and thrilling speech which the queen pronounces while her husband passes along the purple-strown pathway to his death (*v.* 949)

ἔστιν θάλασσα—τίς δέ νιν κατασβέσει;—
τρέφουσα πολλῆς πορφύρας ἰσάργυρον
κηκῖδα παγκαίνιστον, εἱμάτων βαφάς...

and compare it with her description of the bloody bath-robe folded about his corpse (*v.* 1382)

πλοῦτον εἵματος κακόν,

and again with the description of the same as it is produced long after by Orestes (*Cho.* 1008)

μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι
φᾶρος τόδ' ὡς ἔβαψεν Αἰγίσθου ξίφος.
φόνου δὲ κηκὶς ξὺν χρόνῳ ξυμβάλλεται
πολλὰς βαφὰς φθείρουσα τοῦ ποικίλματος,

and again with the narrative of Orestes in the *Eumenides* (464)

ποικίλοις ἀγρεύμασι
κρύψασ', ἃ λουτρῶν ἐξεμαρτύρει φόνον,

we shall feel that the 'sea (θάλασσα) full of welling crimson', of which in the lines first quoted the murderess is really thinking, is the bloody bath, in which the colours of the fatal robe would be blotted out in one tint more precious than them all. Is there then reason to believe that the term θάλασσα was so applied to *a bath* as to make the phrase πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα in the passage before us intelligible as an allusion to it? I think there is. There is evidence that for a *lustral* bath of ceremony, such as was that which Agamemnon took[1], the term θάλασσα was technical. This supposition will explain a passage in Aristophanes, where the rites are described which are practised in curing the blind Plutus at the temple of Asclepios (*Plut.* 656),

πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ θάλατταν ἤγομεν,
ἔπειτ' ἐλοῦμεν.

There is nothing in the circumstances there described to make it likely that the real sea was accessible, and the abrupt appearance of this θάλαττα in the description has caused perplexity. But the difficulty disappears if the water of purification as such was called θάλασσα. And this is probable enough in itself. That mysterious qualities of purification were attributed to sea-water is shown by the proverb

θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τἀνθρώπων κακά (Eur. *Iph. T.* 1191).

[1] *Eum.* 636 δροίτῃ περῶντι λουτρά. It was the bath which one coming from a journey and from war would properly take as preliminary to sacrifice.

Where the sea was accessible it was for lustral purposes preferred (Soph. *Ai.* 654), and for the purpose of lustration salt water was artificially made (Theocr. 24. 96). From this belief to a ritual use of the term for the water of ceremonial lustration, whether actually drawn from the sea or not, is a natural process of language; and that this step was actually taken is indicated by the gloss of Hesychius *θαλασσωθείς· ἁγνισάμενος*[1].

We may conclude then that this 'conspiracy of fire and sea-water, utter enemies before' is a phrase intentionally ominous. It is manifest what an excellent opportunity for dramatic effect is given, when the man is made to speak in a manner so apt to startle the guilty consciences of those about him who are apprised of the deadly secret and at this moment are in the agony of suspense.

P.

v. 817. ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν.

"*About midnight*, at which time the lion goes to his prey and Troy was taken. The poet naturally marks the hour according to the time of the representation of the play; for in the second half of March, when the Great Dionysia were celebrated, the setting of the Pleiads occurs for observers in Greece between ten and eleven at night (Keck, *Neue Jahrb.* 1862, p. 518)". Wecklein.

I mention this explanation, because the traditional interpretation, which I accept, is in my view of the play not unimportant to the plot. But I do not think the alternative possible. The passages cited by previous commentators (see the note) indicate that *the setting of the Pleiads* had a fixed conventional significance, established before the time of Aeschylus and still familiar; it marked the season of the winter storms and the end of the season for sailing. And apart from this, how, without specification of the time of year, could the setting of a constellation be used to mark an hour of the day? Surely the audience could not be expected to bethink themselves, or indeed to know, at what hour the Pleiads set at the time of the Great Dionysia; and even if they could, would it not be strange to make a character on the stage, suddenly and without indication of the purpose, use language not

[1] My attention was directed to this gloss by Mr H. B. Smith, who also observes that in later Greek at least the term *θάλασσα* was used also for certain religious vessels; see *e.g.* Sophocles *Lexicon s.v.* *θαλασσίδιον*.

intelligible except under the particular circumstances of the representation? What, we may ask, did the poet intend to be done when the speech should be recited at other times of the year?

Nor is it clear why Agamemnon should recall the fact that Troy was taken at midnight. He had only too good reason for remembering at this moment that it was taken just before the season of storms. The details of the capture have no connexion with this play and are never mentioned in it. It is possible indeed to detect in this passage an allusion to the 'wooden horse', but it is doubtful and at any rate not essential.

Q.

vv. 887—894. *λέγοιμ' ἂν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα,...*
ὁδοιπόρῳ διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος,—
τερπνὸν δὲ τἀναγκαῖον ἐκφυγεῖν ἅπαν·
τοιοῖσδε τοίνυν ἀξιῶ προσφθέγμασιν.

If this passage has been rightly explained above, much of the difficulty of it has been made by the specious emendation of Schütz, *τοί νιν* for *τοίνυν* in *v.* 894. As I understand the words, *τοίνυν* is indispensable. The majority of recent texts have *τοί νιν*, with full stops at *ῥέος* and at *ἅπαν*. Weil however and others are justly dissatisfied, and for myself I scarcely think Mr Housman too trenchant when he says of this reading and punctuation "That Aeschylus did not put *v.* 893 where it now stands, severing *v.* 894 from the *προσφθέγματα* to which it refers, is evident to every one who understands, I do not say the art of poetry, but I say the art of writing respectable verse" (*Journal of Philology* XVI. p. 269). Nor is the matter much mended if we move *v.* 893 to some other place. If the catalogue is supposed to be properly ended at *πηγαῖον ῥέος*, there is no excuse for the addition of *τοιοῖσδέ τοί νιν ἀξιῶ προσφθέγμασιν* as a separate remark. The fact is that *vv.* 893—894 are feeble, irremediably feeble, both in themselves and in contrast to the noble lines which precede them; and if we are really to explain the passage, *we must accept this bathos for part of what we have to explain.* What the MS. gives us is certainly not successful eloquence; but was it meant to be?

To omit the two verses (one is not enough) is a simple method, but arbitrary. Mr Housman carries off *vv.* 890—893 (interchanged and slightly altered) to the end of the speech, and places them after *v.* 902.

R.

vv. 922—933.

It has been noticed in the Introduction that this altercation between Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra may have different effects according to the manner in which we suppose it to be delivered and acted. Does the king willingly change his purpose? The general opinion, which in such a matter has much weight, seems to be that he does, that he is pleased by the pomp which he pretends to dislike, and gladly submits to the pretended compulsion.

Undoubtedly the words admit this, and the scene might be so acted. But it should be pointed out that neither the words nor the circumstances require it. Whatever the king's wishes, he could not escape the scene prepared without a scandalous and ridiculous disturbance which the matter in itself was not worth. Mr Sidgwick (Introduction, p. xvii) speaks of 'the almost pathetic futility of his pious caution in taking off his shoes, when at last he agrees to tread the purple'. The futility is apparent; and the act seems to be that of a man who dislikes what he is doing but cannot help himself. Clytaemnestra's object in the whole demonstration is to exhibit the king to the gazers in an unpopular light, to make it appear that he has come back from Asia with his soldiers to assume (like some Pausanias) the state and manners of an Asiatic tyrant. He takes off his shoes by way of a counter-demonstration. But, as he remarks with vexation, he is still at a disadvantage (*v.* 937). Every one could see that his servants were prostrating themselves and spreading the pavement with carpets, while those at a distance could not appreciate or perceive his reluctance.

Our reading of the scene will depend on the view we take of the king's state of mind in relation to his wife. The impression which his language makes upon me is that he hates her, or rather is prepared to hate her, as cordially as she hates him, that he suspects her to be the chief thing ὅτῳ δεῖ φαρμάκων παιωνίων, and that if he had lived another day, she and her abettors would have assisted at a memorable demonstration of his 'kindly surgery'. If he does not fear her, that is because he is ignorant of all that makes her formidable.

There is another point in this scene which is worth notice, as illustrating the supposed relations between the pair. If the king has the slightest regard for his wife or attributes to her any affection for him, why does he insult her by his behaviour to Cassandra? Would

an Athenian audience have thought it decent in a returning husband to bring a δορίκτητον λέχος along with him in state to the door of his own house, and give to the mistress of it a public order to receive her kindly? Contrast the behaviour which Sophocles attributes in like circumstances even to the Heracles of the *Trachiniae* (225 foll.), the indignation of the spectators when his purpose is discovered, and the bitter feelings of Deianira herself. The language of the king respecting Cassandra, and the manner in which he puts her forward, has but one possible meaning; and if anything is required to perfect the outrage, it is the canting phrase with which it is accompanied. There is at any rate no doubt that this is the view of Clytaemnestra (see *v.* 1438 foll.).

S.

vv. 966—969. τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπέδως
δεῖγμα προστατήριον
καρδίας τερασκόπου ποτᾶται,
μαντιπολεῖ δ' κτλ.

The question of the possibility of the reading δεῖγμα, as against δεῖμα the conjecture of Triclinius, depends upon our conception of the metaphor by which this passage holds together. The boding heart is a τερασκόπος, *i.e.* ā μάντις, a professional interpreter of signs, prodigies etc. What may be the relation to this figure of the words δεῖγμα προστατήριον ποτᾶται?

Firstly προστατήριος, a word of well-marked associations, signifies *standing before* or *set before a door* or *gate*, and applies usually to images of the gods there placed (as in this scene). Secondly, we observe that the speakers have not a definite anticipation but only a vague surmise of something wrong; or, to put the same thing in terms of the metaphor, the heart is not actually prophesying but only offering to prophesy. Thus, to satisfy the context, δεῖγμα προστατήριον τερασκόπου should be something *set before the door of a μάντις to advertise him as such*: and this something, it would seem, ποτᾶται, *i.e. hovers* or *flutters*.

It is a coincidence odd, if accidental, that in another place we find again the word δεῖγμα associated with similar expressions. In the *Acharnians* (989) Dicaeopolis has retired into his house to prepare a feast of the birds which he has bought from the Boeotian; and the Chorus outside perceive traces of the preparations in the feathers which are flung out before the door. This they describe in the odd phrase

τοῦ βίου δ' ἐξέβαλε δεῖγμα τάδε τὰ πτερὰ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν. The words τοῦ βίου δεῖγμα, *as an advertisement of his way of living*, are not such as would first occur, but must be recommended by some familiar association. The two passages suggest, I think, that the professional μάντις used a δεῖγμα or *sign* before his door, and that this sign was a *feather* or *feathers* (πτερά), a rebus explaining itself by the fact that πτερόν means *an omen*. (Aristophanes perhaps borrowed from this custom the notion of a dealer in πτερά (*wings*) which is used in the *Birds*; see *v.* 1330 σὺ δὲ τὰ πτερὰ πρῶτον διάθες τάδε κόσμῳ· τά τε μουσίχ' ὁμοῦ τά τε μαντικὰ καὶ τὰ θαλάττια κτλ.) If this were so, the meaning of Aeschylus would be simple, *Why doth my heart, prophet-like, still set in front this fluttering sign?*

At any rate here is reason for retaining δεῖγμα provisionally and on the chance of more certain information: δεῖμα, obvious as it is, does not well satisfy the other words, especially προστατήριον.

T.

vv. 995—1000. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων
κτησίων, ὄκνος βαλὼν
σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου,
οὐκ ἔδυ πρόπας δόμος
παμονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν,
οὐδ' ἐπόντισε σκάφος.

"...Σφενδόνη, as the Lexicon will show, has many meanings, and this passage demands one more......The main idea of the word, as of the English *sling*, seems to be not *throwing* but *suspension*. Thus 'a sling for the arm', 'a suspending bandage', and the 'bezel', which contains the jewel of a ring, are called σφενδόνη. It is possible that some kind of instrument for suspending and weighing heavy goods was called a *sling*; and εὔμετρος points to something like this. In that case ὄκνος βαλών would be not the terror which flings away a cargo in a storm, but the prudent apprehension which *rejects* and refuses to embark part of a load found to be too heavy for the boat, though it would always be more profitable to take more. This would not be open to the just objection of Mr Housman against the common view, that ὄκνος means properly not *terror* but *shrinking, hesitating*: ὄκνος would not suggest but prevent such prompt action as throwing away cargo in a storm. And we have then also a better explanation of ἀπό, *discharging*

from the scale. This would give the sense adopted in the translation" (ed. 1).

Since this was written, an almost exact parallel has been pointed out by Mr W. Wyse (*Class. Rev.* XIV. 5). "One of the inscriptions discovered by the French at Delphi proves that a σφενδόνη was part of an 'elevator' (*tolleno*) used in unloading vessels. The document...was first published by Bourguet (*Bull. de Corr. Hell.* 20, 1896, *p.* 197 *sqq.*) and is now to be found in Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, *n.* 591, Dittenberger, *S. I. G.*[2] *n.* 140, Baunack, *Sammlung d. Griech. Dialekt-Inschriften*, *Bd* II. *Hft* 6, *n.* 2502, *p.* 652". By this positive evidence (*q.v.*) the above guess is raised, I think, to a fair degree of certainty.

U.

v. 1076. αὐτοφόνα κακὰ κάρτα· ναί,
ἀνδροσφαγεῖον κτλ.
v. 1081. κλαιόμενα τὰ βρέφη σφαγὰς
ὀπτάς τε σάρκας κτλ.

M 1076 καρτάναι, 1081 τάδε.

In spite of the scholium ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγχόνῃ, which assumes that καρτάναι stands for καὶ ἀρτάνᾳ, they are right who hold that the word ἀρτάνη did not here occur. Hanging was to the Greeks a type of suicide (*v.* 866), and with neither hanging nor suicide have we anything to do. Most of the bolder suggestions, *e.g.* καράτομα (Kayser), proceed on the assumption that the metre of *v.* 1076 should be corrected to that of *v.* 1081. But the error is rather in *v.* 1081.

In *v.* 1076 Cassandra, as the elders observe, is 'tracking the scent' of the Thyestean crime, coming nearer to it with each word: *Nay, it is an accursed house, full of guilty secrets, yea, of murders unnatural, aye verily, a place where human victims bleed, where babes besprinkle the altar.* The asseverations μὲν οὖν, κάρτα, and ναί mark the growing clearness and certainty, till it rises (*v.* 1080) to actual vision. The word κάρτα, here qualifying αὐτοφόνα, is a favourite with the poet.

In *v.* 1081 on the other hand we should adopt for τάδε the archaic demonstrative τὰ, in which reading the later MSS. (*Florentinus*, *Venetus*, *Farnesianus*) agree. It would almost seem as if they must have been guided by some note or tradition, independent of M, which has now disappeared. At any rate it is likely enough that τάδε, a correct explanation of τά, should have come wrongly into the text of M, as τόδε (a not very correct explanation) has for τὸ in *v.* 175.

V.

vv. 1167—1171. ἰὼ πρόπυργοι θυσίαι πατρὸς
πολυκανεῖς βοτῶν ποιονόμων· ἄκος δ' οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν
τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχειν παθεῖν,
ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνους τάχ' ἐμπέδῳ βαλῶ.

The question presented by this last line does not perhaps admit a complete answer. But I would call attention to a consideration overlooked. It is commonly assumed that ἐμπέδῳ is wrong. But it is, I submit, certain that ἐμπέδῳ is right. Let us consider what the context requires: ἐγὼ δὲ κτλ. answers to πόλιν μὲν κτλ., the second part of a dependent antithesis being turned, as often in poetry (*e.g. v.* 1287), into an independent sentence; 'Alas! how many a victim from his rich herds did my father sacrifice on behalf of his town! Yet they availed not at all to save the city from receiving such fate as it hath, while I' etc. In spite of Priam's offerings, he and his are utterly destroyed, all but Cassandra, and she will soon be added to the rest. Such is the connexion of thought.

Now we must not suppose that by error the MS. could offer exactly what is wanted to round off the period effectively, that is to say, an antithesis bringing together Cassandra and Priam. That θερμόνους *hot-brained, rash-witted* is in itself a good word is not disputed, nor that it fitly applies to Cassandra, as she was regarded by her incredulous countrymen. But ἔμπεδος (τὸν νοῦν) *solid* or *sound* (*of judgment*) is not only a good antithesis to θερμόνους, *but is applied in Homer as a characteristic description to Priam*, *e.g. Il.* 20. 183 εἰσὶν γάρ οἱ (Πριάμῳ) παῖδες, ὁ δ' ἔμπεδος οὐδ' ἀεσίφρων. The contrast of the epithets here (ἐγὼ θερμόνους, ἐμπέδῳ αὐτῷ), when the prophecies of the 'sick-brained' Cassandra have been realized in the ruin of her 'wise' father and all his kin, is surely not accidental. Whoever wrote ἐμπέδῳ meant to oppose it, as the Homeric epithet of Priam, to θερμόνους. Neither is it in the manner of ancient editors, so far as we know them. Indeed an editor capable of it must have known more about Aeschylus than is known now, and have had better material for his text.

From this antithesis then we should start, whether for interpretation or correction. Nor is there room for much variation of meaning: ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνους τάχα πρὸς ἔμπεδον αὐτὸν ἐρρήσω—something like this is what we should look for. But again, in the verb at least this is what we have; for that the intransitive βάλλειν *to fall*, *to go* was used for

ἔρρειν appears in the popular phrases *βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν*, *βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας* etc.: nor are we in a position to say that the popular use might not find a parallel in poetry.

The question then narrows itself to this, whether the case of ἐμπέδῳ could be constructed with βαλῶ in the sense required. An ordinary locatival dative would offer no difficulty. In the older grammar of poetry βάλλειν (in the sense of *going to*) would naturally take that case, on the analogy of πεδίῳ πέσε, οὔδει ἐρείσθη, θαλάσσῃ ἔλσαι Ἀχαιούς etc. (Kühner, *Gr. Gramm.* § 423. 4; Monro, *Homeric Grammar* § 145. 4) and of the transitive βάλλω (Eur. *Med.* 1285 etc.). The extant 'locatival datives of *persons*' (Monro, *H. G.* § 145. 4) do not offer a parallel, and we should not expect it. But there is perhaps reason here for a construction not exactly proper to a personal object. The ruined city, the slaughtered Trojans, and the dead king, who is the type of the whole, are not here truly conceived as personal. They are, if we may mark the latent metaphor more precisely, the heap *on* which the survivor will soon be flung. In these circumstances a locative case is not to be hastily condemned. If there is error, it should be in βαλῶ.

The elision of τάχα is noticeable, being generally confined in Aeschylus to set phrases such as τάχ' ἄν, τάχ' εἴσομαι (see on *v.* 898), but it is not a ground for objection.

W.

v. 1210. ΧΟ. πῶς δῆτ' ἄνακτος ἦσθα Λοξίου κότῳ;
ΚΑ. ἔπειθον οὐδέν' οὐδὲν ὡς τάδ' ἤμπλακον.

All texts here adopt some conjectural reading, for the most part one of these two:

πῶς δῆτ' ἄνακτος ἦσθα Λοξίου κότον; Wieseler:
πῶς δῆτ' ἄνατος ἦσθα Λοξίου κότῳ; Canter:

both assuming the sense to be *How then did Apollo punish thee?* From the first, though ἄνακτος is weak and the use of ἦσθα (*didst thou feel*) doubtful, the sense sought can perhaps be obtained. The second, though largely supported, seems impossible. The words could only mean *How then didst thou escape the anger of Loxias?*, to which the answer does not correspond[1]; nor can the Elders, who know the story by

[1] On the alleged parallel in *Cho.* 539 see note there.

rumour (*v.* 1083) and are drawing it out by leading questions, possibly assume that Cassandra did escape.

But further there is error in the assumption, common to both suggestions, as to the sense required. There is nothing in the foregoing narrative to prompt the question *How then did Apollo punish thee?* The god might have taken vengeance in a hundred ways. From the emphasis laid upon ἤδη in *vv.* 1208 and 1209 the point appears to be this. Before Cassandra proved false, Apollo had *already* conferred the prophetic gift. Now it was the established rule that "the gods themselves cannot recall their gifts". How then, asks the enquirer, could he undo what had been done? Cassandra answers that he did so, and shows how. He left the prophetic gift (which he might not take away) but yet effectually annulled it by causing her never to be believed.

From this point of view we shall see that there is in *v.* 1210 no error at all, or at most an error of accentuation. Ἄνακτος is not the genitive of ἄναξ but the verbal adjective from ἀνάγειν, represented in Latin by *revocabilis*[1]. That which is οὐκ ἄνακτόν τινι, *alicui non revocabile*, is that which *he cannot bring back* or which, as we should say, 'has escaped beyond his recall'. Cassandra, having received the stipulated reward upon a mere promise and before performance, might have seemed to be *beyond the recall of Loxias' wrath*; and the question asked is, how then the angry god could bring her back. The use of the word was probably suggested by the legal associations of ἀνάγειν and ἀναγωγή as applied to the process for the recovery of what was paid by mistake or fraud.

In *vv.* 1205—1208 there is dispute as to the meaning of παλαιστής, νόμῳ, and ἠρημένη, upon which I shall only say that I believe the text to be sound.

X.

vv. 1227—1229. οὐκ οἶδεν οἷα γλῶσσα μισητῆς κυνός,
λέξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην
ἄτης λαθραίου, τεύξεται κακῇ τύχῃ.

The explanation which I take from Mr Macnaghten and Prof. Bury (partly anticipated many years ago by Mr E. S. Thompson) is open to one objection. There is undoubtedly great boldness of metaphor in saying that 'a tongue...reaches forth a cast'. But there is no mixture of metaphors, for there is only one metaphor: γλῶσσα is not meta-

[1] On the question of accentuation see ἔπακτος or ἐπακτός.

phorical; neither is κυνός, being simply an opprobrious term for the adulteress. Except in ἐκτείνασα δίκην (secondary sense) there is no metaphor, and to this metaphor τεύξεται is adapted. The words γλῶσσα and δίκην are far from each other, and the transition is smoothed by the intermediate steps λέξασα and ἐκτείνασα. The real subject being *Clytaemnestra*, γλῶσσα easily drops out of view. Also the allusive force of ἐκτείνασα and of δίκην would palliate what otherwise might not please. When a writer wishes to make verbal points of this kind (and Aeschylus loved them), he often does some violence to his language. The transition supposed is different in kind from the unthinkable imagery of γλῶσσα κυνὸς λείξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρὸν οὖς (Ahrens and Madvig) 'a tongue licking and pointing a joyful ear'.

It is no objection to Prof. Bury's view that we have no other specimen of δίκη (or δική) = βόλος. Δίκη necessarily meant *cast* in Greek, as long as the verb δικεῖν existed and was known, and might have been used in that sense, for such a purpose as the present, even if no one had done so before or did so afterwards.

The reading adopted by Dr Wecklein is

οὐκ οἶδεν οἵαν γλῶσσα μισητή, κυνὸς
λείξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρὸν οὖς δίκην,
ἄτην λαθραῖον κτλ.

The suggestion to separate κυνὸς from the preceding words and to write μισητή is attributed to Kirchhoff. I mention this as being the only version adopting the readings λείξασα (Tyrwhitt) and φαιδρὸν οὖς (Ahrens, Madvig), which appears tolerable. But it does not really avoid the fatal phrase γλῶσσα...ἐκτείνασα οὖς: and moreover the positions of the words κυνὸς...δίκην make it difficult to suppose that they mean *like a dog*.

Y.

v. 1266. ἴτ' ἐς φθόρον, πεσόντα θ' ὧδ' ἀμείβομαι. (?)

With diffidence I repeat here the conjecture offered in the Appendix to my edition of the *Medea* (and adopted by Mr Sidgwick) ΠΕΣΟΝΤΑΘΩΔ for ΠΕΣΟΝΤΑΓΑΘΩΔ, literally 'and now ye are down, thus I requite you', to be explained by the action of trampling upon them, whence ἄλλην ἄτην in the next verse. It has the advantage of accounting perfectly by repetition of letters (ΤΑΤΑ whence ΤΑΓΑ), for the corruption: see a parallel in *v.* 222 ΤΕΓΕ for γε. I retain however ἀμείβομαι, the *original* reading of f, not the future ἀμείψομαι, easily

explained as an alteration to suit διαφθερῶ. Hermann's ἐγὼ δ' ἅμ' ἕψομαι is followed by Dindorf, Wecklein and others. But *v.* 1267 points to retaining the verb ἀμείβεσθαι.

See however Munro (*J. Ph.* XI. p. 139) and Mr R. A. Nicholson (*Class. Rev.* XIII. 272). Mr Nicholson objects that πεσόντα is weak, and suggests κάτω γὰρ ὧδ' ἀμείβομαι *I pass to the world below thus* (*without adornment*). I still think my conjecture possible and even probable, but prefer not to place it in the text.

Z.

vv. 1276—1277. βωμοῦ πατρῴου δ' ἀντ' ἐπίξηνον μένει
θερμῷ κοπείσης φοινίῳ προσφάγματι.

These verses have been interpreted as if θερμῷ φοινίῳ προσφάγματι were an instrumental dative, *with hot and bloody sacrifice.* For πρόσφαγμα is cited Eur. *Tro.* 624, where προσφάγματα is used of Polyxena slain at the tomb of Achilles, Eur. *Hec.* 41 (of Polyxena), id. *Hel.* 1255, id. *Alc.* 845. The meaning of προ- in the compound, as in other compounds, probably varied. In general it meant *on behalf of* (προ- = ὑπέρ); thus while the living chiefs received their allotted captives, Polyxena was slain *on behalf of* the dead Achilles. So in Eur. *Iph. T.* 458, the victims of Artemis are πρόσφαγμα θεᾶς *slain for the goddess*, where the object of the preposition is expressed. But Eur. *Hel.* 1255, προσφάζεται μὲν αἷμα πρῶτα νερτέροις, shows that προ- easily lent itself to the temporal sense, 'the blood shed first', the 'opening sacrifice', and that is perhaps rather the meaning here. At the same time the meaning 'a sacrifice *for* the dead' is not inappropriate, since Agamemnon and his paramour are 'wedded in death' according to the grim conception of Clytaemnestra (*v.* 1447) and each therefore slain *for* the other.

But θερμῷ should be a predicate and equivalent to θερμῷ ὄντι. In Aeschylus, where *two* adjectives are used, one is usually a predicate (see on *Theb.* 850), and here the separate and emphatic position of θερμῷ marks it as such.

The construction of the dative is that which with strictly personal subjects is found even in the older prose, and might be called a dative 'absolute' with as much or as little propriety as the corresponding genitive (Gildersleeve, *Pindar Ol. and Pyth.*, Preface p. xciii). The genitive 'absolute' indicates that the act or condition described by it stands in a relation to the main act conceived as resembling that of the

origin or 'point from which', or some other relation expressed by this case. Where the relation to be described resembles rather that of the dative, the older language uses that case also with freedom. Most common are datives 'absolute' modelled on the personal dative 'of interest' *e.g.* Herod. 6. 21 *ποιήσαντι Φρυνίχῳ δρᾶμα Μιλήτου ἅλωσιν ἐς δάκρυα ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον*, Thuc. 4. 120 *ἀποστᾶσι δ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Βρασίδας διέπλευσε*: but there are also datives 'absolute' resembling the instrumental, as Theocr. 13. 29 *Ἑλλάσποντον ἵκοντο νότῳ τρίτον ἆμαρ ἀέντι*, and others again where, as with the genitive, special relation disappears in the general relation of *circumstance*, Xen. *Ages.* 1. 2 *τοῖς προγόνοις ὀνομαζομένοις, ἀπομνημονεύεται ὁποστὸς ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους ἐγένετο*, Pind. *Ol.* 2. 76 *λείφθη Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέντι Πολυνείκει* etc. (See for a large collection of examples Kühner, *Gr. Gramm.* § 423, 25, *f*, and also note on *Theb.* 217.) The use is very seldom found in the fully developed prose style, having been driven out partly by the genitive, partly by the more precise though more cumbrous use of prepositions or of dependent clauses with conjunctions. So in *Eum.* 592 *οὐ κειμένῳ πω τόνδε κομπάζεις λόγον* the dative represents what a prose-writer would more accurately have expressed by *ἐπί*, or, if he had used a simple case at all, by the genitive *κειμένου*. See also *Ag.* 1298, and note there. Here the relation of the dative, so far as it is specialized, is partly that of 'interest', extended to a subject not strictly personal, partly that of mere succession *to*, as in *vv.* 1171, 1338 and Soph. *O. T.* 175 *ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλῳ* (*one after another*) *προσίδοις ὅρμενον*, where see Prof. Jebb's note. Either way the meaning is that the slain Agamemnon will immediately *receive* another victim in Cassandra.

The use of this dative 'absolute' is particularly natural here (and for a similar reason in *Theb.* 217) where the genitive case is appropriated, so to speak, by *κοπείσης*. As to this genitive itself, which is sometimes suspected, it would seem that no other case could be used: *κοπεῖσαν* with *μένει* would hardly be correct; a present or future participle would be required. But *κοπείσης* as explained in the note is really general and therefore properly in the aorist.

APPENDIX II.

On the correspondence of Strophe and Antistrophe.

On this subject, which is happily not very important to the play before us, I shall be as brief as possible, referring the reader to my edition of the *Seven against Thebes*, Appendix I., the conclusions of which I shall here assume. "Upon the whole review, we see that three types of variation from strict syllabic correspondence are common in the *Seven against Thebes*—for we are not justified in assuming that an equal strictness must be found in all the works even of the same poet—(1) a 'syncopated' foot answering to a complete foot[1]; (2) the trochaic or 'cyclic' dactyl answering to a trochee proper; (3) a long syllable in 'thesis' answering to a short syllable". I have reason to believe that the evidence offered for this has been found satisfactory, and as to (1), the only part of the statement likely to cause surprise, I may now cite the express agreement of Dr Fennell[2].

The case of the *Agamemnon* is different. The tradition presents indeed not a few departures from syllabic correspondence. They are of exactly the same kind as those which are common in the *Septem* and, taken in connexion with them, are not open to reasonable suspicion. But they are exceptional; and in general this play exhibits a much nearer approach than the *Septem* to the stricter treatment which seems to have been approved by Sophocles. This fact, we may observe, so far from diminishing the strength of the evidence for these variations, increases it very greatly. If Aeschylus had always used the stricter system, and if the departures from it in the MS. text were the result of erroneous copying, we should expect to find them on the average

[1] – = –⏑, in musical notation ♩. = ♩♪.

[2] *The Parodos of Aeschylus' Septem etc.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1889.

equally prevalent in different plays. And the contrary fact points to the contrary inference.

I will now simply enumerate in classes the variations which may be called regular, and add a few words on some cases of more peculiarity or difficulty.

§ 1. – = – ⏑ (𝅗𝅥. = 𝅗𝅥 𝅘𝅥𝅮).

205. να | ων– | και– | πεισμα | των
218. τεκ | νον δα | ιξ– | ω δομ | ων

The vertical lines mark the divisions of the feet. The mark – indicates the 'holding' of the preceding note.

380. παρ | εστι | τουτ– | εξιχ | νευσαι
397. προ | βουλο | παις α | φερτος | ατας

384. πατ | οιθ ο δ | ουκ– | ευσεβ | ης
401. τριβ | ω– | και– | προσβο | λαις–

387. πνε | ον– | των– | μειζον | η δικ | αιως
404. δι | ω– | κει– | παις– | πτανον | ορνιν

388. φλε | ον– | των– | δωμα | των υ | περ– | φευ–
405. πολ | ει– | προς– | τριμμ α | φερ– | τον– | θεις–[1]

390. μαντον | ωστ απ | αρκ– | ειν– | ευ πραπι | δων λα | χοντα
407. τον δ ε | πιστρο | φον– | τωνδε | φωτ αδικ | ον καθ | αιρει

414. κλον | ους– | λογχιμ | ους τε | και– | ναυβατ | ας οπ | λισμους
430. παρ | εισι | δοξ– | αι φερ | ουσ– | αι χαρ | ιν ματ | αιαν

449. ψηγμα | δυσδακ | ρυτον | αν– |
τηνορ | ος σποδ | ου γε | μι– |
467. των πολ | υκτον | ων γαρ | ουκ α |
ποσκοπ | οι θε | οι κελ | αι– |

699. κελσαν | των Σιμο | εντος | ακτ– | ας επ | αξι | φυλλους
715. παμπροσθ | η πολυ | θρηνον | αι– | ων– | αμφι πολ | ιταν.

1482. η μεγαν | οικοις | τοισδε | δαιμονα | και βαρυ
1506. ως μεν αν | αιτοις | ει– | τουδε φον | ου τις ο

Some of these variations may, as we should expect, be reduced to syllabic regularity by such expedients as the insertion of τε or γε[2]. But others cannot. No objection, except that grounded on metre,

[1] But see note *ad loc.*

[2] Not that these insertions are justified by the usage of the poet. Both in 205 and in 401 the inserted τε is otiose and undesirable.

lies against *οἴκοις τοῖσδε* in *v.* 1482. In *v.* 414 the supposed metrical difficulty has led to criticisms and proposals, which without it would not have been entertained. In the order of the words *ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λογχίμους τε* (*i.e. κλόνους ἀσπίστορας λογχίμους τε din of shield and spear*) there is nothing irregular: *τε* follows according to rule the word (*λογχίμους*) which it serves to couple on: and where adjectives are thus coupled by *τε*, some other word frequently stands between them, *e.g.* in Eur. *Hec.* 267 *αἰχμάλωτον χρή τιν' ἔκκριτον θανεῖν κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν* (*i.e. ἔκκριτον...κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν*). On the other hand the double change proposed for the sake of syllabic responsion (*ἀσπίστορας κλόνους τε καὶ λογχίμους ναυβάτας θ' ὁπλισμούς*) makes an arrangement not only irregular but obscure. The first *τε*, however it be taken, is both useless and misplaced[1].

§ 2. – = ⏑ in the unaccented part of the foot.

This (the 'unnatural' long syllable of H. Schmidt's terminology) is found in almost all poets and in every kind of metre. It occurs in the *strophae* of the *Agamemnon* with moderate frequency.

{192. χαρ | ις βι | αιως | σελμα
{200. εχ | ων παλ | ιρρο | θοις εν

{207. τριβ | ω κατ | εξ – | αινον | ανθος | Αργει | ων.
{220. ρεεθ | ροις πατ | ρῳ – | ους χερ | ας βω | μου πελ | ας.

Here, as is not uncommonly the case, the feet interchange. All the feet are equal, most of them true trochees, the second in each set (not counting the anacrusis) a 'syncopated' trochee, while the trochaic ⏊ – appears in the fifth foot of the first set, and in the fourth foot of the second. So also in the first feet of *vv.* 392, 3, 4 compared with *vv.* 409, 10, 11 and in the last foot of *v.* 393 compared with that of *v.* 410. So in *vv.* 426, 27, 28. So in *v.* 1105 *γένει* by 1119 *τεύχει*: see Soph. *O. C.* 1557 and 1568. So in the first syllable (anacrusis) of *v.* 1162 *νεογνὸς* compared with *v.* 1173 *καὶ τίς σε*.

One or two more cases are doubtful. In *v.* 1469 the correction *ἐμπίτνεις* is probable, in *v.* 1512 *προβαίνων* is not improbable. In *v.* 462 Orelli's conjecture *ἔχθοντας* would give an instance, but the MS. *ἔχοντας* is better.

[1] According to the MS. there would be a 'syncopated' foot in *v.* 441 *ουσ– | μεν γαρ ε | πεμψεν*: but see note there.

§ 3. – ⏑ ⏑ = – ⏑ (♩ ♫ = ♩. ♪).

This, which in the *Septem* is scarcely less frequent than (1) and (2), is in the *Agamemnon* rare. Two examples are close together:

718.	ε	θρεψ –	εν δε λε	οντος	ι –
		νιν δομ	οις αγα	λακτον	οι –
		τας αν	ηρ φιλο	μαστον	
		εν βιο	του προτε	λειοις etc.	
728.	χρο	νισ –	θεις δ' απε	δειξεν	η –
		θος το	προς τοκε	ων χαρ	ιν –
		γαρ τροφ	ας α	μειβων	
		μηλοφον	οισιν	αταις etc.	

Both the last lines have been variously emended, but the suggested changes in *v.* 730 (*e.g.* τροφᾶς ἀπαμείβων) are doubtful and those in *v.* 731 (see note there) more so. The mere fact that the same peculiarity occurs in two successive lines is a reason for thinking that there is no error. Such variations are naturally often grouped together. See also *v.* 715, as given in § 1 above. In *v.* 412 we should perhaps retain κλοπαῖς, and in *v.* 458 προδίκοισιν.

§ 4. – = ⏑ ⏑ (♩ = ♫).

This, the 'resolution of a long syllable', is not unfrequent.

(?) 394.	λακτισ	αντι μεγ	αλα δικ	ας –		
(?) 411.	ησχυ	νε ξενι	αν τραπ	εξ –		
417.	α	τλητα	τλασα	πολυ δ αν	εστε	νον –
433.	βε	βακεν	οψις	ου μεθ	υστερ	ον –
1090.	εκας α	ποσταт	ει –			
1098.	χερος ο	ρεγομεν	α –			

See also *vv.* 422, 1110, 1162, 1454, and 1482. Some of these can be removed by plausible changes, some not without violence.

I have reserved for separate consideration one or two places of special character or special importance.

421.	παρ	εστι	σιγ –	ας α	τιμος α	λοιδορ	ος –
	α	διστος	αφεμεν	ων ιδ	ειν –		
437.	το	παν δ αφ	Ελλαδος	αι –	ας ξυν	ορμεν	οις –
	πεν	θει α	τλησι	καρδι	ος –		

It will be seen that there is here no variation other than those

which have been illustrated above, except the lengthening of the last syllable of ἀλοίδορος by the ictus of the verse and by the rhythmical or musical break between 'line' and 'line'. This is found again at *v.* 436

τωνδ υπ | ερβατ | ω τερ | ᾰ – |

and is in fact too familiar to require further notice[1]. In 422 = 438 there is one variation, in 421 = 437 there are two, all of common types. And I would ask the reader to notice, as a testimony in favour of the MS. text, the balance of *vv.* 421 and 437. The metre of both verses is trochaic. Each verse exhibits two variations or quasi-trochees, *and the same two* (see above, §§ 1 and 3), *differently disposed in the verse*, so that the total quantity, so to speak, of each verse is exactly the same. That this balance has been produced by blundering I cannot believe, and I therefore hold both verses correct[2].

A more doubtful problem is presented by the following:

990. μάλα γάρ τοι τᾶς πολλᾶς ὑγιείας
ἀκόρεστον τέρμα· νόσος γὰρ
γείτων ὁμότοιχος ἐρείδει.
1004. τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γᾶν πεσόνθ' † ἅπαξ θανάσιμον
πρόπαρ ἀνδρὸς μέλαν αἷμα τίς ἂν
πάλιν ἀγκαλέσαιτ' ἐπαείδων;

Here there is undoubtedly some error, since *v.* 1004 has no construction. The correction commonly received (πεσόν Auratus) is facile but far from certain. It is perhaps as likely that ἐπὶ γᾶν, which could well be spared, covers some neuter adjective or participle to which πεσόν τε was attached. The rhythm of 990, compared with 1004, is or appears to be exceptional and unsatisfactory. It is not probable that the correspondence here was strictly syllabic, but no positive conclusion is to be reached. I will note merely that the parts which can be construed as they stand can also be sung as they stand,

991. ακορ | εστον | τερμα νοσ | ος – | γαρ γει | των ομο
| τοιχος ερ | ειδει
1005. προπαρ | ανδ – | ρος μελαν | αιμα τις | αν παλιν | αγκαλεσ
| αιτ επα | ειδων,

[1] The principle extends to the case of *v.* 1410 ἀπέδικες, ἀπέταμες· | ἀπόπολις δ' ἔσει, where to produce the appearance of regularity we ought to print ἀπόπολις κτλ. in a separate line. But the arrangement of lines, which is purely arbitrary, does not really affect the question. The break of music and rhythm, corresponding to the pause in the sense, is there, however we mark it, and is allowed to protect the final syllable of ἀπέταμες from abbreviation.

[2] The remarks on *vv.* 743, 754, which here follow in ed. 1, have been cancelled in deference to the objections of Dr Headlam and others.

and that they exhibit the same kind of balance which has been noticed in *vv.* 421 and 437.

In *vv.* 249 and 1132 we have metrical irregularities which, though at first sight widely dissimilar, may perhaps be referred to the same principle. In *v.* 249 there is apparently a strange hiatus

κρόκου βαφὰς δ' ἐς πέδον χέουσα[1]
ἔβαλλε κτλ.

and in *v.* 1132 a hypermetric syllable, πάθος ἐπεγχέασα answering to πτεροφόρον δέμας. In neither place does the sense give any hint of error[2]. In the first, the solution is, I believe, that the short vowel actually is elided as usual, the scansion being this:

κροκ | ου βαφ | ας δ– | ες πεδ | ον χε | ουσ– | ε | βαλλ etc.



answering to

260

τεχ | ναι δε | Καλ– | χαντος | ουκ α | κραντοι | δικ | α etc.



If so, the case really falls under § 1 (see above), and it may throw some light upon *v.* 1132. In principle there is nothing surprising in the occurrence of such a 'hypermetric' syllable as we find in πάθος ἐπεγχέασα. If it were common, every one would regard it as natural, and the wonder is that it is not. The final trochee of πάθος ἐπεγχέασα answers to the final long syllable of πτεροφόρον δέμας, or to put the same thing otherwise, the musical bar is completed by a note in the first and by a rest in the second. When the Romans first began to imitate Greek metres, they abounded in such 'hypermetric' lines, as well as in lines with a superfluous 'anacrusis'[3], and the same thing is true *mutatis mutandis* of many modern metres. It is not likely *prima facie* that the most severe treatment would avoid an occasional lapse (if such it be) of this kind.

Lastly in those parts of the play which are written in *dochmii*[4], or

[1] Note that a hiatus of this kind has no resemblance to those cases where at the end of the line a short syllable taking the stress of the rhythm is treated as long. This is quite common; while the examples of the other are rare and unsatisfactory.

[2] 249 βαφὰς...ῥεούσας Keck, χέουσ' ὧδ' Hermann, χέουσ' ἅδ' Kennedy, βαλοῦσ' ἕκαστον Karsten, βάλ' ὧν ἕκαστον Ahrens.—1132 θροεῖς...ἐπεγχέας Franz, and see *ad loc.*

[3] As to the superfluous 'anacrusis' see on *S. c. Th. v.* 723, Appendix I. p. 136.

[4] An interesting discussion of the *dochmius* will be found in the paper of Dr Fennell already cited, pp. 6 foll. With most of what he says I entirely agree.

in metre for practical purposes not distinguishable from the dochmiac, there are a few noticeable variations. In *v.* 1408 ἐξ ἁλὸς ὀρόμενον (MS. ὀρώμενον) may be correct, though exact correspondence is restored by ὄρμενον. In *v.* 1164 (if κακὰ, as seems probable, be omitted) we have μινυρὰ θρεομένας answering to γοερὰ θανατοφόρα. The first is a not uncommon variety of *dochmius*, in which the first and second 'long' syllables are 'resolved'. The second would be an iambic trimeter with 'resolved' syllables (γοερα | θανατο | φορα): on the iambic trimeter as a variation in this metre see on the *Septem* 206, 219 etc. (Appendix I. p. 133 in my edition). The same variation is exhibited by M in *Ag.* 1143 ἀηδόνος μόρον, answering to *v.* 1130 κακόποτμοι τύχαι: it is not certain therefore, though probable, that Hermann was right in changing the order to μόρον ἀηδόνος.

A small question, partly metrical partly linguistic, is presented by the word ἀκόρεστος (*vv.* 1105, 1138), where it is usual to substitute the (assumed) equivalent form ἀκόρετος. But the metrical evidence is dubious, and perhaps the form. In *v.* 1105 there is already exact responsion, if the second syllable of ἐνύδρῳ (*v.* 1119) be scanned as long. In *v.* 1138, the scansion intended, since in the *dochmii* of this scene the metre is generally continuous, may be ξουθὰ 'κόρεστος: that 'κόρεστος might answer to μελοτυπεῖς all would admit.

APPENDIX III.

On the Parts of the Conspirator (*v.* 1522) *and the Soldier* (*v.* 1650)[1].

It happens that we have from Pollux a note on the *dramatis personae* of the *Agamemnon*, which, though it deals directly only with a detail, presupposes and necessarily implies a certain view of the whole play. The passage runs as follows (Poll. IV. 109): ὁπότε μὴν ἀντὶ τετάρτου ὑποκριτοῦ δέοι τινὰ τῶν χορευτῶν εἰπεῖν ἐν ᾠδῇ, παρασκήνιον καλεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὡς ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι Αἰσχύλου· εἰ δὲ τέταρτος ὑποκριτής τι παραφθέγξαιτο, τοῦτο παραχορήγημα ὀνομάζεται, καὶ πεπρᾶχθαί φασιν αὐτὸ ἐν Μέμνονι Αἰσχύλου. 'But where, in place of a fourth actor, one of the chorus-performers was required to speak in lyric, this is called a παρασκήνιον: see for example the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. If there was something *extra* spoken by a fourth actor, this is termed a παραχορήγημα: it is said to have occurred in the *Memnon* of Aeschylus'.

The meaning of this is clear and undisputed. For the performance of a play there were commonly provided, in addition to the regular chorus, three actors trained for spoken parts; and as a general rule this number was the limit, and the plays were so written that not more than three persons (besides the *choreutae*), having parts to speak, should be before the audience at the same time. Pollux is here treating of the rare exceptions to this rule. He divides them into two kinds. The ordinary function of the three ὑποκριταί was to deliver the dialogue. The most natural conception therefore of a 'fourth actor' would be a person speaking in ordinary dialogue (ἐν λόγῳ) in a scene in which all the three regular ὑποκριταί were already occupied. Of this however, which is the case put second by Pollux, he seems not to have known by his own observation a single instance. 'It is said', he writes, 'to have

[1] Reprinted from *Classical Review*, Vol. IV. p. 3.

occurred in the *Memnon* of Aeschylus', which play he had plainly not seen. His care in marking that he is here speaking at second hand is worthy of notice, and enhances the authority of what he states without such a limitation. The other, the first-mentioned exception, is of a very peculiar kind. It is where, in a scene requiring the simultaneous presence of the three regular actors, there is found another speaker who, being a *choreutes* and speaking in lyric, is not exactly a 'fourth actor', but, as Pollux words it, 'in place of a fourth actor'. For this he refers, as if the case were plain and notorious, to the *Agamemnon*.

It will be seen on reflexion that there is a little difficulty in understanding the nature of this peculiar case. The 'quasi-actor', says Pollux, is 'one of the *choreutae*.' Why then, it might be asked, should not his part be delivered by the ordinary chorus-leader? And why, since the *choreutae* for the purpose of this rule were not counted as 'actors' at all, should this case be regarded as exceptional or noticeable in any way? We shall see the reason presently.

We are not now concerned with the question how far the technical terms παρασκήνιον and παραχορήγημα, as here used, were either correct in themselves or generally recognized. As Pollux uses them they are in a way correlative, the chorus in the first case supplying something *extra* to the 'stage', the fourth actor in the second case being a sort of addition to the chorus[1]. We however are concerned only with the facts to which the terms are applied.

In order to show the bearing of this testimony on the structure of the *Agamemnon*, I will now set out (1) the *dramatis personae* and distribution of the play as commonly printed; (2) the *dramatis personae* and distribution according to this edition. Those of the MSS. it is scarcely worth while to discuss. Nobody defends or is likely to defend them.

(1) *Dramatis personae.*

A Watchman.
Chorus of Elders.
Clytaemnestra.
A Herald.
Agamemnon.
Cassandra.
Aegisthus.

[1] For a comparison of the various uses of these terms, see Mr Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*, note on p. 212, by which note my attention was called to the passage.

These characters are distributed in the play as follows:

1.	*Prologue.*	Watchman.
2.	*Parodos and Stas.* 1.	*Chorus.*
3.	*Episode* 1.	Clytaemnestra. *Chorus.*
4.	*Stas.* 2.	*Chorus.*
5.	*Episode* 2.	Herald. Clytaemnestra. *Chorus.*
6.	*Stas.* 3.	*Chorus.*
7.	*Episode* 3.	Agamemnon. Clytaemnestra. Cassandra (silent).
8.	*Stas.* 4.	*Chorus.*
9.	*Episode* 4.	Clytaemnestra. Cassandra. *Chorus.*
10.	*Interlude* (1330—1370).	Agamemnon (behind the scenes). *Chorus.*
11.	*Episode* 5 *and Finale.*	Clytaemnestra. Aegisthus. *Chorus.*

It will be seen that there is here not the least trace of the 'fourth actor' found in the play by Pollux. Indeed it can scarcely be said that the play absolutely requires three. Very little ingenuity, certainly not more than the ancients employed, as we are told, to preserve their limitations in other places, would be required to allow the mute Cassandra of Episode 3 and the speaking Cassandra of Episode 4 to be taken by different maskers; and except at this point two actors, with the Chorus, could easily perform the whole.

(2) *Dramatis Personae.*

A Watchman.
Chorus of Elders.
Clytaemnestra.
A Conspirator, leading the
Chorus of Conspirators.
A Herald.

Agamemnon.
Cassandra.
Aegisthus.
A Soldier of Aegisthus.

By these the different portions of the play are spoken or sung as follows:

1.	*Prologue.*	Watchman.
2.	*Parodos and Stas.* 1.	*Chorus of Elders.*
3.	*Episode* 1.	Clytaemnestra. Conspirator. *Chorus of Elders.* *Chorus of Conspirators.*
4.	*Stas.* 2.	*Chorus of Elders.*
5.	*Episode* 2.	Conspirator. Herald. Clytaemnestra. *Chorus of Elders.*
6.	*Stas.* 3.	*Chorus of Elders.*
7.	*Episode* 3.	Agamemnon. Clytaemnestra. Cassandra (silent).
8.	*Stas.* 4.	*Chorus of Elders.*
9.	*Episode* 4.	Clytaemnestra. Cassandra. *Chorus of Elders.*
10.	*Interlude.*	Agamemnon (behind the scenes). *Chorus of Elders.*
11.	*Episode* 5 *and Finale.*	Clytaemnestra. Conspirator. Aegisthus. Soldier. *Chorus of Elders.*

Now if this was the arrangement known to Pollux, we can not only see at once the application of his remark, but can explain it with precision down to the minutest peculiarity. The greater part of the play, all but the last scene, can be performed by the regular three actors. But in the last scene there is a small fourth part, which answers exactly to the description of the ancient scholar. The scene

consists of two sections, (1) a dialogue, partly λόγος but chiefly lyric, conducted mainly by Clytaemnestra and the Coryphaeus (1371—1576), and (2) the finale, in iambic and trochaic λόγος, mainly conducted by Aegisthus, Clytaemnestra, and the Coryphaeus. These two sections are perfectly continuous. There is no interval between them, and no legitimate opportunity for an exit. Now from the evidence of the text it appeared to me that in the finale one of the soldiers accompanying Aegisthus must have spoken twice, on each occasion one trochaic verse (1650 and 1653), and also that in the preceding lyric dialogue, at 1522, the words

οὔτ' ἀνελεύθερον οἶμαι θάνατον
τῷδε γενέσθαι,—

which are usually struck out as inexplicable, must have been spoken by a partizan of Clytaemnestra, that is to say, by the Conspirator. I did not observe, what I ought no doubt to have observed, that, as it would hardly be practicable for the performer here taking the person of the Conspirator to quit the scene before the entrance of Aegisthus and his troop, I had thus made, to this small extent, a demand for a *fourth actor*. But all the more striking, I think, is the undesigned coincidence between the independent inference and the statement of Pollux.

For the parts of the dialogue were commonly assumed to be distributed among the actors in the order of their importance. In the *Agamemnon* the protagonist would of course play Clytaemnestra in the last scene as throughout. The deuteragonist would take Aegisthus. Of the two remaining parts, the Soldier, not the Conspirator, would be given to the regular tritagonist, as having two speeches to make instead of only one, and also as occurring in common dialogue (λόγος). We should therefore naturally hold, as Pollux and his authorities held, that the speech of the Conspirator (1522—1523) must be regarded as the exceptional *fourth part*. It is in lyric metre (anapaests), not in the metre of the ordinary dialogue; and so it is described by Pollux. And, most remarkable of all, it is spoken by a person whose ambiguous character, between *choreutes* and actor, makes the peculiar language of his description quite simple and natural. The Conspirator is 'one of the *choreutae*'. He stands to the secondary chorus (see *vv.* 363 foll.) in the same relation as that of the regular Coryphaeus to the regular chorus; and in fact in my text I have, upon this analogy, marked his parts (as well as the one song of the sub-chorus) by the sign XO. β'. On the other hand he is no member of the regular chorus but, in the common technical sense, a ὑποκριτής. When therefore, as at this place, he recites

anapaests in a scene otherwise requiring the simultaneous presence of three speakers (in addition to the regular chorus), he is what Pollux calls him, 'one of the *choreutae* speaking in lyric in place of a fourth actor'.

I cannot but think that this absolute agreement between an inference drawn from MSS. of the fourteenth century and a statement dating from the second not only substantiates the inference, but also strongly fortifies the authority of our traditional text. The makers of our MSS. had, it is needless to say, not a notion of illustrating the observation of Pollux. The words to which his note refers are in the MSS. tacked, in defiance of grammar, to the following speech of Clytaemnestra, while in modern texts, as I have already said, they are desperately struck out. Yet there they stand in the *Codex Florentinus*, as they must have stood in the Aeschylus of Pollux, having survived the copyists of more than a millennium, to illustrate and justify the true tradition.

What, it may be asked, have we done with the testimony of Pollux so long as we have endeavoured to distribute the *Agamemnon* so as to accord with the Byzantine story? It has been set aside. The copyist of Pollux, it is said, introduced the reference to the *Agamemnon* by error, because a few lines after came a reference, quite differently worded, to the *Memnon*. There is no one who will not gladly be relieved of the supposed necessity for such a hypothesis as this.

INDEX I. GREEK.

(*The numbers are those at the head of the notes indicated.*)

INDEX II. ENGLISH.

(Only such references are given in this Index as could not conveniently find a place in the foregoing.)

ADDENDUM.

In *v.* 714 the point of αἰνόλεκτρον may turn most simply upon the two possible meanings of the word, (1) *whose marriage is a glory* (αἶνος) and (2) *whose marriage is horrible* (αἰνός). Troy, μεταμανθάνουσα ὕμνον, will now apply the second. This however would not exclude a reference to Ἀλέξανδρος.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.